DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 160 JC 860 371

AUTHOR Flewellen, William C., Jr.
TITLE Business Administration and Management: Current Trends and Future Directions.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts State Board of Regents of Higher Education, Boston.
REPORT NO Pub-144456-132-300-5-86-CR
PUB DATE Mar 86
NOTE 147p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accreditation (Institutions); *Business Administration Education; College Faculty; College Students; Community Colleges; Educational Finance; *Educational Trends; Enrollment Projections; Higher Education; Postsecondary Education; Private Colleges; Program Evaluation; Resource Allocation; State Colleges; State Surveys; Two Year College Students; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

Drawing from site visits to 39 public and private colleges in Massachusetts, this report presents an evaluation of college programs in business administration and management and recommendations for improvement. Section 1 provides an overview of the statewide study and its findings. After identifying the colleges visited and the members of the visitation teams, this section: (1) summarizes concerns specific to community college, state college, and university programs; (2) compares private and public programs with respect to accreditation status, student quality, and adequacy of faculty; (3) offers financial data on dollars of instructional budget per full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty and FTE student, share of workload versus share of funds, FTE faculty/secretary ratio, tuition, and tuition and dollars of instructional budget per FTE student; (4) offers enrollment projections; and (5) presents recommendations for community colleges, state colleges, and universities. Section 2 looks at the business administration/management programs in community colleges, focusing on students, courses, faculty, resources, facilities, overall concerns, major problems, and recommendations. Section 3 examines state college programs in terms of courses, students, faculty, library and facility resources, placement, curriculum, management and leadership, measures of adequacy of the number of faculty, measures of quality and scholarly activity, measures of funding, and recommendations. In section 4, university programs are assessed, covering curriculum, students, faculty, financial support, library resources, placement, and recommendations. Finally, an employment prospectus for program graduates is presented. A summary of accreditation standards is appended. (RO)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. SCHINNESS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED271160

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

CURRENT TRENDS

AND

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Dr. William C. Flewellen, Jr.
Chairman
Dean Emeritus
College of Business Administration and
University Professor of Industrial Development
Director of the Institute for Business
The University of Georgia

JC 860 371

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

BOARD OF REGENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

MARCH 1986

Publication # 144456-132-300-5-86-CR
Approved by Daniel Carter, State Purchasing Agent

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page (s)
A. Section I: Overview	
1. Introduction	1
2. Concerns	3
2.1 Community Colleges	3
2.2 State College	4-5
2.3 Universities	6
3. Comparison of private and public programs	7
3.1 Groupings of institutions	7
3.2 Accreditation status	8
3.3 Student quality	10-12
3.4 Adequacy of faculty	12-24
3.41 Overall size	
3.42 Percent with doctorates	
3.43 Student/faculty ratios	
3.44 Class sizes	
3.45 Research, publications and presentations	
3.46 Professional development	
3.47 Use of merit raises	
3.48 Salaries	
4. Resources	24-32
4.1 Dollars of instruction budget per FTE faculty and per FTE student	
4.2 Share of workload vs. share of funds	
4.3 FTE faculty/secretary ratio	
4.4 Tuition	
4.5 Tuition and dollars of instructional budget per FTE student	

	Page (s)
5. Projections	34-36
6. Recommendations	36-40
6.1 Community Colleges	
6.2 State Colleges	
6.3 Universities	
6.4 Proposals from State Colleges	
B. Section II: Community Colleges	41
1. Introduction	42
2. Students	43-44
3. Program	45-47
4. Faculty	47-48
5. Resources	48
6. Facilities	48
7. Answer to Overall Questions	49
8. Major Problems and Recommendations	50-54
9. Tables	55-71
C. Section III: State Colleges	72
1. Programs	73
2. Students	74
3. Faculty	74-77
4. Resources	78
a. Libraries	
b. Facilities	
5. Placement	78
6. Curriculum	79
7. Management and Leadership	80-81
8. Measures of Adequacy of Number of Faculty	81-82
9. Measures of Quality and Scholarly Activity	82

	Page (s)
10. Measures of Funding	83
11. Recommendations	85
12. Tables	86-94
D. Section IV: Universities	95
1. Introduction	96
2. Program	97-99
3. Curriculum	99-100
4. Students	100-101
5. Faculty	101-104
6. Resources	104-106
a. Relative Funding	
b. Secretarial Support	
c. Libraries	
7. Placement	107
8. Recommendations	107-108
9. Tables	109-117
Section V: Employment Prospectus	118-125
E. Appendices	
1. Appendix A - Summary of AACSB Accreditation Standards	126-132

1. Introduction

The review of programs in business or management included three groups of institutions. In October and November of 1984, a team of four spent two weeks visiting the four public universities and the six state colleges with business programs. The four universities are the University of Massachusetts--Amherst, the University of Massachusetts--Boston, the University of Lowell, and Southeastern Massachusetts University. The six state colleges are Bridgewater State College, Fitchburg State College, North Adams State College, Salem State College, Westfield State College and Worcester State College.

Each of the team members had been dean of a college of business administration for many years. Three had been president of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, and all had served on many committees that reviewed schools to determine their accreditation status. Vitae are included in Appendix A. The team worked as one team of four visiting one school each day. Two sets of materials were reviewed prior to the visits. Copies of forms for supplying the data are included in Appendix B.

Fifteen (15) public community colleges were visited in February. A half-day was spent at each institution. Materials were reviewed in advance. Copies of the reporting forms are included in the Appendix B. Two teams were used. Each consisted of one member of the team that reviewed the public universities and state colleges and one community

college administrator. Vitae are included in Appendix A.

Three team members were used to visit 20 independent universities and colleges. Two of the team members were selected from the team that reviewed the public universities and state colleges. The third was dean of a school of business. Vitae are included in Appendix A. Two team members visited each institution. Data were reviewed prior to the visits. Copies of the reporting forms are included in Appendix B. Only nineteen institutions are included in the discussion. The forms received were not complete; therefore, an additional request for the information was made. A copy of the request form is included in Appendix B. An overview report to the Board was made on June 24, 1985, by the Chairman, W. C. Flewellen, Jr.

For each of the three groups conflicting reports of information made accuracy difficult. Furthermore, visits were very short so that the teams had no time to delve into inconsistencies or examine possible weaknesses or strengths in depth. The factual information in the reports is that reported by the institutions. Thus, the finds and recommendations in the reports are best viewed as concerns for further in-depth review before decisive action is taken.

2. Concerns

2.1 Community Colleges

Of the three groups of public institutions, the community colleges appeared to best understand their missions and to operate at an acceptable level of quality. However, the community colleges share several problems with the other public institutions. These problems are indicated below:

A. Separation of the evening program from the full-time teaching faculty appears to inhibit their involvement in community service activity.

B. The self-sustaining feature of the evening program mitigates against quality of the program.

C. Secretarial support appears inadequate.

D. Professional development of faculty needs substantial improvement.

E. Advising of students appears to need improvement.

F. A high percentage of students in vocational tracks (non-college transfer) transfer to four-year institutions.

G. Very little effort is given to student placement upon graduation.

H. Funds are needed for computer hardware and software.

More detailed analysis is contained in the community college section of the review.

2.2 State Colleges

Business programs in the state colleges were found to need significant improvement in their quality. Factors beyond the control of the state colleges, as well as internal management, appear to contribute to the low level of quality found in them. The concerns of the team are addressed at length in the state college section of the report; however, a summary listing is given below:

A. Graduate programs must be offered in the evening and must be self-sustaining.

B. Institutions have too little control over faculty time. If faculty teach 12 hours and hold the specified number of office hours, they can teach at other institutions, work at jobs in the private sector or operate businesses. These are activities that they opt for, because incentives for scholarly productivity and service to the business program are almost non-existent.

C. There are few incentives for faculty to obtain the terminal degrees or to engage in scholarly activity.

C.1 There is almost no use of merit raises to provide incentive.

C.2 Faculty teach overloads in the evening programs for extra pay which is very low.

C.3 There is little planning for professional development and almost no resources for travel, seminars, conferences, memberships in professional organizations.

D. Salaries are too low to be attractive to terminally qualified faculty. (They may be adequate for the present faculty.)

E. Quality of faculty must be enhanced. (Almost no Ph.D.'s, little involvement regionally and nationally, almost no scholarly productivity.)

F. Curricula do not meet AACSB standards.

G. Management of resources appears to need review. Class sizes are low. Student/faculty ratios are low. Percentages of the AACSB minimum faculty for accreditation are high. Perhaps funds should be re-allocated for secretarial support, professional development and travel.

H. Minimal emphasis is placed upon communication skills.

I. Both faculty and students need to develop greater competency in using computers in their business coursework.

J. Resources per FTE faculty and per FTE student are low.

K. Placement activity places very little emphasis upon placement but concentrates upon career advising.

L. Effective faculty recruiting processes are not well understood.

M. There is no program to develop chairs or distinguished professorships to provide role models and to work with other faculty to improve program curriculum quality.

2.3 Universities

A wide range of quality was found among the four state universities. The University of Massachusetts--Amherst compares favorably with other major state universities. The University of Massachusetts--Boston and the University of Lowell should have programs of better quality than was found. Both should be accredited by the AACSB at both the bachelor's and master's levels. The business program at Southeastern Massachusetts University needs substantial improvement. Common concerns for the four universities are given below:

A. Only one of four is accredited by AACSB.

B. Maximum salaries are not competitive.

C. Universities provide almost no leadership for the state colleges. Easier access for state college faculties to a doctoral program is needed.

D. Except for the University of Massachusetts--Amherst, faculty scholarly productivity is low.

E. Management of resources appears to need review. Class sizes are low. Student/faculty ratios are low. Percent of the AACSB minimum faculty for accreditation are adequate. Yet, maximum salaries are not competitive. Travel and professional development funds are low.

F. There is no program to develop chairs or distinguished professorships to provide role models and to work with other faculty.

Twenty independent institutions volunteered for participation in the review process. The ranges of missions and qualities of the programs varied greatly. The independent institutions section of the report provides insight to the programs of the 20 institutions.

3. Comparison of independent and Public Programs

Comparison of programs of the independent institutions with those of the public ones provides insights useful in addressing the operations of the public institutions.

3.1 Groupings of Institutions

For more meaningful presentations the independent institutions were divided into two groups. One group, Group I, includes instituions roughly comparable to the state universities. The other group, Group II, includes those roughly comparable with the state colleges. Tables I.A. and I.B. give data on the several factors used in placing institutions into Group I or Group II. In Group I of the independent institutions, only Clark University had a small enrollment; however, the quality of the students and its accreditation status indicated that it should be included. In Group II, the quality of the program at Simmons College was sufficiently high to cause questioning of its inclusion in Group II. Tables I.A. and I.B. also provide data for a summary comparison of public and independent institutions; however, each set of data will be examined in more detail in this overview section.

The comparison of public institutions is made by consideration of accreditation status, quality of students, faculty and resources.

TABLE I-A

GROUPING OF PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS
1983-84 DATA

Institution	Salaries[1] Competitive at AACSB Level	FTE Faculty	Percent of Faculty with Ph.D.	FTE Students	Average SAT	Accredited by AACSB
Group I:						
UMA	A	79	81	1656	1072	Yes
UMB	A	68	64	948	961	No
UL	A	62	68	1321	935	No
SMU	E	38	17	819	916	No
AVERAGE		61	57	1186	973	
Group II:						
BSC[2]	D	20	0	305	840	No
FSC[3]	D	19	8	422	875	No
NASC[3]	E	19	24	413	903	No
SSC	E	31	19	712	845	No
Westfield[3]	E	16	15	382	917	No
Worcester	E	12	27	314	868	
AVERAGE		20	16	425	868	

[1] Level A - Accredited, independent; Level B - Accreited, public; Level C - Non-accredited, private; Level D - Non-accredited, public; Level E - not competitive.

[2] No full professors and no associate professors.

[3] No full professors.

TABLE I-B

GROUPING OF INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS
1983-84 DATA

Institution	Salaries[1] Competitive at AACSB Level	FTE Faculty	Percent of Full-time Faculty with Ph.D.	FTE Students	Average SAT	Accredited by AACSB
Group I:						
Babson	A	102	96	2219	1076	Yes
Bentley	A	144	65	3240	1016	No
Boston C.	A	77	85		1096	Yes
Boston U.	A	130	95		1094	Yes
Clark U.	A	16	94	206	1115	In Process
N.E. U.	A	129	91	2396	910	Yes
Suffolk	C	73	84	1286	863	In Process
AVERAGE		96	87	1869	1024	
Group II:						
AIC	E	14	21	390	885	No
Assumption	B	11	11	197	923	No
Gordon	E	6	33	96	1017	No
Merrimack	D	25	4	507	922	No
Simmons	A	21	58	358	910	No
Springfield	E	7	33	267	845	No
Stonehill	E	16	0	309	1010	No
WNEC	E	52	22	970	879	No
AVERAGE		22	22	387	913	
Group III:						
Emmanuel	E	4	25	75	880	No
Pine Manor	E	6	0	7		No
AVERAGE		5	13	41	880	

[1] Level A--Accredited, independent; Level B - Accredited, Public; Level C -Non-accredited Independent; Level D - Non-accredited, Public; Level E - not competitive.

3.2 Accreditation Status

Accreditation by the AACSB cannot be ignored even though resources to be provided do not permit accreditation to become a realistic goal. Every effort should be made to provide resources to enable each of the public institutions to set accreditation as its goal. Major corporations judge schools by their accreditation status when recruiting. The better students also judge schools by their accreditation status. Certainly as important, qualified faculty judge schools by their accredited status. A summary of AACSB minimum standards for accreditation is attached as Appendix C.

Table II indicates that the seven independent institutions in Group I have, with the exception of one institution progressed further toward accreditation than have the state universities, only one of which has achieved accreditation. However, the independent institutions in Group I have significantly better quality programs than the public ones when measured by accreditation status.

None of the Group II institutions have achieved accreditation, despite the high regard that citizens of Massachusetts are reported to have for their independent institutions of learning. There appears to be a great opportunity for the state colleges, by becoming accredited, to make a significant gain in quality as well as in image by achieving accredited status.

3.3 Student Quality

SAT scores provide insight into student quality and permit comparisons. Table III shows that SAT scores at the public

TABLE II

ACCREDITATION STATUS--AACSB
1984-85

	Number of Programs	Number Accredited	Number Visited 1984-85	Number Not Accredited
Group I:				
Independent	7	4	2	1
Public	4	1	0	3
Group II:				
Independent	9	0	0	9
Public	6	0	0	6

institutions are generally lower than those at the independent ones.

3.4 Adequacy of Faculty

3.41 Overall Size

Adequacy of size of faculty is a function of number of faculty and number of students. A useful method for comparing adequacy of faculty for a number of institutions is to compare the extent to which their faculties exceed or fail to reach the minimum faculty required for accreditation by the AACSB. The minimum faculty for accreditation is calculated by dividing the fall term undergraduate student credit hours by 400 and the graduate student credit hours by 300. The sum of the quotients is the minimum faculty required for accreditation.

Table IV.A. indicates the percentage that the institution's faculty is of its minimum for accreditation. All Group I institutions exceed their minimums and the percentages of public and independent institutions are approximately the same.

In Group II the percentages of the independent institutions are better than those of the public ones. All institutions exceed or approximate the minimum. Very good universities (see Table IV.A.) approximate 135 percent. Nine Florida universities averaged 128 percent. Percentages higher than these averages indicate a need for review of resource management, especially if the program is not accredited.

3.42 Percent of Full-time Faculty with Appropriate Doctorates

The AACSB requires that only 50 percent of the minimum

TABLE III

STUDENT
SAT SCORES
1983-84

	Group I		Group II	
	Independent	Public	Independent	Public
High	1115	1072	1017	917
Mean	1024	973	913	868
Low	863	916	830	830

U.S. average score for students who expressed an intention to study business was 852.

U.S. average score for students who entered business programs was 873.

Business programs at nine universities:

High	1082
Mean	1020
Low	960

Institutions: University of Georgia, University of Connecticut, University of New Hampshire, University of Vermont, Auburn University, University of Maine, University of Rhode Island, University of South Carolina, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

TABLE IV-A

ADEQUACY OF FACULTY
OVERALL SIZE
FTE FACULTY AS A PERCENT OF AACSB
MINIMUM FOR ACCREDITATION
1983-84

	Group I		Group II		Nine Florida Universities	Very Good Accredited Schools[2]
	Independent	Public[1]	Independent	Public		
Number of Faculty as a Percent Minimum for Accreditation						
High	200	197	175	119		
Mean	134	137	143	107	128	135
Low	101	110	97	90		

[1] Boston University omitted.

[2] Survey by W. C. Flewellen, Jr.: University of Illinois, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, Indiana University, University of Minnesota, Ohio State University, University of Texas, University of Wisconsin.

faculty required for accreditation at the undergraduate level and 75 percent of the minimum required at the graduate level have appropriate doctorates. The J.D. degree is appropriate for teaching business law. The master's/CPA combination is appropriate for accounting principles. Independent institutions have higher percentages of appropriate doctorates (see Table IV.B.) With the exception of Simmons College, Group II institutions have very few faculty with doctorates. Good state universities approximate 80 percent.

3.43 Student/Faculty Ratios

The AACSB maximum ratio for accreditation is 25 to 1. The very good accredited schools will approximate 19 to 1. Nine Florida state universities averaged 20 to 1. Table IV.C. indicates that student/faculty ratios are generally good. The low ratios call for review of use of resources. The high ones indicate need for additional faculty or reduction in student credit hours.

3.44 Class Sizes

Class sizes are as much an indication of good management of resources as of adequacy of faculty. Most of the great schools of business teach selected lecture method courses to classes with large enrollments. Through research and practice this approach has come to be acceptable. Experience with many unaccredited schools is that most of them will not accept the trade-off of somewhat larger classes for progress toward accreditation.

TABLE IV-B

ADEQUACY OF FACULTY
PERCENT OF FULL-TIME FACULTY
WITH APPROPRIATE DOCTORATES
1983-84

	Group I		Group II	
	Independent	Public	Independent	Public
High	94	81	58	27
Mean	86	57	25	16
Low	65	17	0	0

---

[1] Group II, independent, without Simmons College:

High:	33
Mean	18
Low:	0

TABLE IV-C

ADEQUACY OF FACULTY
STUDENT/FACULTY RATIOS
1983-84

	Group I[1]		Group II	
	Independent	Public	Independent	Public
High	33/1	27/1	27/1	23/1
Mean	21/1	20/1	19/1	21/1
Low	13/1	13/1	15/1	18/1

AACSB maximum for accreditation:	25/1
Very good accredited schools:	19/1
9 Florida universities:	20/1

[1] Does not include Boston College.

Table IV.D. indicates that class sizes in Group I are generally relatively small. In Group II they are quite small, especially in the state colleges. In view of the scarcity of funds for travel and professional development of faculty and the low level of faculty salaries, reconsideration of class size philosophies is indicated.

3.45 Research, Publication and Presentations

AACSB standards require that "a reasonable cross-section of the faculty should be regularly engaged in research and publication. The scholarly productivity of a faculty offering a graduate program should exceed that of a faculty offering only an undergraduate program.

'Professional involvement includes academic, business and professional experience which contributes to enhanced teaching and research competence."

The report on the public institutions includes a summary of a count of publications and presentations from faculty vitae. Complete faculty vitae were not available for some of the independent institutions; however, from the data available and the visits to campuses, some assessment was possible. Table IV.E. gives those assessments. Independent Group I institutions' faculties were more active in scholarly productivity than were the faculties of the public universities. Scholarly productivity was low in the Group II programs. Goal setting and attitude changing, as well as incentive systems, appear needed.

TABLE IV-D

ADEQUACY OF FACULTY
CLASS SIZES
1983-84

	Group I		Group II	
	Independent[1]	Public	Independent	Public
High	50	39	28	33
Mean	35	31	25	20
Low	20	24	22	18

Averages for nine Florida universities:

Lower level classes	57
Upper level classes	41

[1]Clark University is not included.

TABLE IV-E

ADEQUACY OF FACULTY
RESEARCH, PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
1983-84

Group I:

Independent	Adequate
Public	1 - Adequate 3 - Inadequate

Group II:

Independent	Inadequate
Public	Inadequate--even for institutions that emphasize teaching

3.46 Professional Development

The AACSB standards require that "The school shall have plans and policies that encourage and provide a framework for continuing professional development and increasing productivity of its faculty."

The independent Group I programs were accredited or at the stage of applying for accreditation. [See Table II.] Their professional development plans and policies were good. Professional development plans and policies of the Group I public institutions need improvement with one exception. The Group II independent institutions place a higher priority on professional development than do the public ones. Both public and independent programs need more emphasis on and resources devoted to professional development of faculty. Given the adequacy of number of faculty and the small class sizes, changes in priorities might provide additional resources for faculty development.

3.47 Use of Merit Raises

The AACSB does not address merit raises; however, lack of incentive for superior performance is so apparent in the Group II public institutions that it is considered a significant deterrrent to improved program quality. Table IV.G. indicates that the independent Group I institutions use merit raises.

These programs have all received accredited status or are near accreditation. They have faculty of good quality

TABLE IV-F

ADEQUACY OF FACULTY
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT[1]
1983-84

Group I:	
Independent	Generally excellent
Public	UMA--excellent
	UMB--fair
	UL & SMU--need improvement
Group II:	
Independent	Minimally adequate
	Fairly high priority
Public	Generally poor
	Low priority

[1] Travel funds, tuition grants, summer grants, reduced loads for research, in-house programs, etc.

TABLE IV-G

ADEQUACY OF FACULTY
USE OF MERIT RAISES
1984-85

Group I:	
Independent	Use merit raises.
Public	Two of four use merit raises.
Group II:	
Independent	Four of nine use merit raises.
Public	None use merit raises.

who are productive in the classroom and in research and publication. The public institutions in both groups do not provide the levels of incentives that the independent ones do. Union contracts appear to be a major factor in the absence of merit incentives in the state colleges.

3.48 Salaries

The AACSB standards do not address salaries for faculties. Group I public institution salary levels are lower than those for the independent institutions by approximately $5,000 at each rank. Maximum salaries are significantly lower than those of other major state universities. [See Table IV.H.] Public institutions' salary levels are approximately $2,000 lower than those for AACSB accredited public institutions. All Group I institutions' salary levels are significantly below those of ten major state universities surveyed.

Group II public institutions' salary levels approximate those of the Group II independent institutions. (See Table IV.I.] However, the levels for both groups are roughly $2,000 lower at professor and associate professor ranks than those for AACSB non-accredited public schools.

4. Resources

Resource levels can be compared by reviewing dollars of instructional budget per FTE faculty and per FTE student, the share of workload compared with the share of instructional funds, and the faculty/secretary ratio. Comparison of tuition also provides insight, especially when compared with dollars of instructional budget per FTE student.

TABLE IV-H

ADEQUACY OF FACULTY SALARIES
COMPARISON OF MEANS OF MEANS AND MAXIMUMS
GROUP I
1983-84

	Group I[1]			
	Independent (7)	Public (4)	AACSB Accredited Public	10 Major[2] State Universities
Professor	$46,250	$38,120	$40,200	$50,500
Associate	$36,577	$30,567	$32,700	$39,100
Assistant	$31,022	$26,799	$28,700	$34,600
Instructor	$28,033	$25,686	$20,500	$27,700
Averages of averages	$35,471	$30,293	$30,525	$37,975
Maximums	$72,500[3]	$50,576	$60,000 >	$95,000

[1] Salaries for public institutions increased an average of 8.5% for 1984-85. Average increase for the independent institutions was not made available. Average increases for AACSB schools have approximated 6% over the past several years.

[2] University of Texas, Austin; University of Florida; Louisiana State University; University of Indiana; University of Michigan; Ohio State University; University of Wisconsin; University of Minnesota; Georgia State University; University of Illinois.

[3] Second highest was $58,600.

TABLE IV-I

ADEQUACY OF FACULTY SALARIES
COMPARISON OF MEANS OF MEANS AND MAXIMUMS
GROUP II
1983-84

	Group II[1] Independent (9)	Public (6)	AACSB Non-accredited Public
Professor	$30,714	$32,092	$34,800
Associate	$28,700	$26,794	$29,400
Assistant	$23,537	$23,463	$24,800
Instructor	$20,434	$19,635	$19,500
Averages of averages	$25,699	$25,496	$27,125
Maximums	$42,000	$37,401	$60,000

[1] Salaries for public institutions increased an average of 8.5% for 1984-85. Average increase for the independent institutions was not made available. Average increases for AACSB schools have approximated 6% over the past several years.

4.1 Dollars of Instructional Budget Per FTE Faculty and Per FTE Student

Table V.A. gives the dollars of instructional budget per FTE faculty member and per FTE student. Averages for the public institutions are significantly lower than for the independent ones. Only the Group I independent institutions compare favorably with the averages for nine Florida universities.

4.2 Share of Workload Vs. Share of Funds

Table V.B. provides insight into the importance attached to the business program by the institutions' central administration. The table compares the percent of the institutions' student credit hours taught by the business program faculty with the percent of the institution's instructional budget that is allocated to the business program. Most business programs are allocated a lower percentage of the instructional budget than the percent that they teach of the student credit hours. However, more than 20 percent less is cause for concern. The data for the independent institutions in Table VI. B. is influenced by inclusion of instituions devoted almost entirely to programs in business. Nevertheless, the share of funds relative to the share of workload in the Group I public institutions is barely adequate when judged by the situation in accredited schools of business and is generally too low for the Group II public programs.

4.3 FTE Faculty/Secretary Ratio

The faculty/secretary ratio [see Table V.C.] is another indicator of adequacy of resources. The ratios for Group I programs are good. The ratios for Group II independent schools are too high for the

TABLE V-A

RESOURCES
DOLLARS OF INSTRUCTIONAL BUDGET
PER FTE FACULTY AND PER FTE STUDENT
1983-84

	Group I		Group II		Nine Florida Universities
	Independent	Public	Independent	Public	
$ Per FTE Fac.					
High	$75,386[1]	$45,269	$45,182	$33,502	
Mean	$56,531	$34,151	$29,724	$24,421	$44,440
Low	$34,122	$20,315	$15,692	$20,216	
$ Per FTE Student					
High	$ 4,306	$ 2,883[2]	$ 2,400	$ 1,307	
Mean	$ 2,953	$ 1,859	$ 1,587	$ 960	$ 2,180
Low	$ 1,704	$ 940	$ 761	$ 765	

[1] Boston University not included.
Simmons College not included.

[2] Boston College not included.

TABLE V-B

RESOURCES
SHARE OF WORKLOAD VS.
SHARE OF FUNDS
1983-84

	Group I		Group II	
	Independent[1]	Public	Independent[2]	Public
Percent of SCH				
High	100	16	31	19
Mean	50	12	18	13
Low	9	7	6	7
Percent of Instructional Budget				
High	100	11	25	13
Mean	50	8	14	7
Low	10	5	3	4
Percent of Instructional Budget as a Percent of Percent of SCH				
High	111	86	129	82
Mean	100	71	78	58
Low	83	55	42	35

[1] Does not include Boston College and Boston University.
[2] Simmons College not included

TABLE V-C

RESOURCES
FTE FACULTY/SECRETARY RATIO
1984-85

	Group I		Group II	
	Independent[1]	Public	Independent	Public
High	9.5	12.6	18.0	31.2
Mean	7.1	8.6	10.3	22.4
Low	5.0	4.6	5.0	13.3

[1] Clark University and Suffolk University not included.
[2] Simmons College not included.

An accepted norm for a productive faculty is generally considered to approximate 7 to 1.

attraction of a productive faculty, and those for Group II public schools are unacceptable if the faculty is to be expected to engage in scholarly activity.

4.4 Tuition and Dollars of Instructional Budget Per FTE Student

In a comparison of costs made among independent and public institutions, tuition charged and instructional costs per FTE student provide some insights. Table V.D. gives data about tuition. Table V.E. gives additional information about instructional costs per FTE student. These data do not take into account the institution's cost other than those in the instructional budget. Table V.E. indicates that in-state tuition covered two-thirds of the instructional cost of the business program for Group I public institutions and covered 113 percent of the instructional cost of the business program for the Group II public schools.

5. Projections

Table VI.A. and B. provide information about expected enrollments in business programs. A report prepared for the Massachusetts Board of Regents of Higher Education[1] projects a 5 percent decrease in enrollment in state colleges, given the most favorable conditions, and a 21 percent decrease taking into account only a change in population. For the state universities the changes were zero change, most favorable, and 18 percent decrease, most unfavorable. Tables VI.A. and B. indicate that Group I

[1] Shaping the Future of Massachusetts Higher Education: Demographic Change and Enrollment Prospects, Division of Planning, Massachusetts Board of Regents of Higher Education, October 1983.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE V-D

RESOURCES
TUITION
1984-85

	Group I			Group II		
	Independent[1]	Public		Independent[2]	Public	
		In-state	Out-of-state		In-state	Out-of-state
High	$9,116	$1,615	$4,172	$7,910	$1,214	$3,069
Mean	$7,577	$1,212	$3,275	$5,732	$1,087	$3,016
Low	$6,100	$ 841	$2,120	$4,620	$ 997	$2,973

[1]Does not include Clark University or Suffolk University.

[2]Does not include Springfield College.

TABLE V-E

TUITION AND DOLLARS OF INSTRUCTIONAL BUDGET PER FTE STUDENT

	Average Tuition[1]		
		Public	
Group I Independent		In-state	Out-of-state
Independent	$7,577		
Public		$1,212	$3,275
9 Fla. Univ.			
Group II			
Independent	$5,732		
Public		$1,087	$3,016

Average Dollars of Instructional Budget Per FTE Student[2]
$2,953
$1,859
$2,180
$1,587
$ 960

[1] 1984-85 data

[2] 1983-84 data

TABLE VI-A

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS
UNDERGRADUATE

	Number of Schools	Number of Students 1983-84	Number of Students 1989-90	Percent Change
Group I:				
Independent				
Stable	5	15,017	15,017	
Increase	0			
Decrease	2	6,196	5,846	
	7	21,213	20,863	-1.7%
Public				
Stable	1	2,000	2,000	
Increase	2	2,619	3,041	
Decrease	1	1,857	1,660	
	4	6,476	6,701	+3.4%
Group II:				
Independent[1]				
Stable	4	3,284	3,284	
Increase	4	1,380	1,489	
Decrease	0	--	--	
	8	4,664	4,773	+2.3%
Public				
Stable	0			
Increase	4	3,206	3,638	
Decrease	2	2,055	1,900	
	6	5,261	5,538	+5.3%
TOTALS: Independent	15	25,877	25,636	- .9%
Public	10	11,737	12,239	+4.3%
Overall	25	37,614	37,875	+ .7%

[1] Nickols College not included.

TABLE VI-8

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS
GRADUATE

	Number of Schools	Number of Students 1983-84	Number of Students 1989-90	Percent Change
Group I:				
Independent				
Stable	4	4,985	4,985	
Increase	2	2,091	2,367	
Decrease	0			
	6	7,076	7,352	+ 6.7%
Public				
Stable	0			
Increase	4	841	1,342	
Decrease	0			
	4	841	1,342	+59.5%
Group II:				
Independent				
Stable	2	930	930	
Increase	3	461	576	
Decrease	0			
	5	1,391	1,506	+ 8.2%
Public				
Stable	0			
Increase	2	82	207	
Decrease	0			
	2	82	207	+152.4%
TOTALS: Independent	11	8,467	8,858	+ 4.6%
Public	6	923	1,549	+67.8%
Overall	17	9,390	10,407	+10.8%

public business programs are planning for approximately a 3.5 percent increase in enrollment at the undergraduate level and approximately a 60 percent increase at the master's level. For independent institutions in Group I the projection was a 2 percent decrease in undergraduate enrollment and a 6.7 percent increase at the master's level.

Group II public programs are planning for a 5 percent increase at the undergraduate level and a 150 percent increase at the master's level, while the independent programs plan for a 2 percent increase in undergraduate enrollment and an 8 percent increase at the master's level.

Review of projections is indicated.

6. Recommendations

The team recognizes that its recommendations will not apply equally to each institution. However, the recommendations address problem areas found in several of them.

6.1 Community Colleges

A. A study should be made to determine the resources needed to enable the community colleges to provide adequate support to the business program faculty in the secretarial, duplication, telephone and other administrative/operating areas.

B. Access to computer hardware and software for both faculty and students should be improved.

C. Professional development programs for faculty should be developed and resources for travel, curriculum and course development, fees for workshops and professional meetings should be provided.

D. The advisability of encouraging business faculty to become more involved with services to the community through adjustments in the organizational structure, lower teaching loads, merit raises and the like should be studied.

E. Student academic advising policies and procedures should be reviewed.

F. The advisability of developing placement units that not only provide career advising but assist with placement should be considered.

State Colleges

6.21 The requirement that graduate programs be self-supporting must be addressed. Because of this dichotomy, the regular business faculty cannot teach a part of their normal load in the graduate program. Much of the teaching is carried out by part-time faculty. No new graduate programs should be initiated until they can be offered by the business faculty as state supported programs. No school with such a self-sustaining graduate program can hope for accreditation until this issue is resolved.

If the problem is not resolved in three years, it is recommended that graduate programs in business be eliminated from the state colleges, despite the need for graduate programs of high quality to serve students across the state.

6.22 Ability to award significant merit raises and ability to exercise more control over faculty use of time should be given high priority in contract negotiations. Perhaps merit raises could be keyed not only to scholarly activity but to service to the business program. Better control of faculty time is essential for accreditation.

6.23 A program that will result in readiness to apply for accreditation in five years for all state colleges should be developed for each state college. Substantial funding will be necessary to achieve this goal.

6.231 Workshops on quality in collegiate education for business for presidents, academic deans, department chairmen and faculty should be provided.

6.232 An AACSB consultant should be assigned to each state college--to develop and oversee implementation of a plan that would move the school to accreditation.

This plan should address organizational structure, admission of students, quality and numerical adequacy of faculty, support personnel, professional development of faculty, curriculum, library, computer resources, facilities and budgetary support. [See Appendix C.]

6.233 A program to develop chairs or distinguished professorships should be developed.

6.3 Universities

6.31 The three university programs not accredited should be given a five-year period to reach the point of applying for accreditation.

6.32 Beyond accreditation, plans should be developed to attract distinguished faculty to provide role models and leadership.

6.33 The universities, especially the University of Massachusetts Amherst, should develop plans to provide leadership for the state colleges. Opportunity for enrollment of state college faculty in a state-supported doctoral program is needed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6.4 Special Proposals Reviewed

6.41 Drs. Winn and Flewellen reviewed proposals from Westfield State College and Southeastern Massachusetts University for initiation of programs in management/business information. As was indicated in an earlier communication, it is recommended that these proposals be approved. The need for improvement of quality of the business programs at these institutions is pressing and reason for placing a moratorium on new programs. However, business programs need options in management information systems. The initiation of the new MIS options appears to intensify the need for quality improvement.

6.42 Drs. Winn and Flewellen reviewed a proposal by Framingham State College for initiation of a bachelor of arts in business administration degree. Members of the team did not visit Framingham State College; however, the proposal indicates that the new degree program would, in effect, be a revision of an ongoing program in economics and thus may already be in existence. Approval of the program as a day program is recommended, but disapproval of any evening program is recommended until changes are made in the organization of the evening programs in the state colleges.

The proposal includes five options: accounting, international business, management information systems, finance or applied microeconomics and general business. The

curriculum appears reasonable, although heavier in economics than most business curriculums.

6.43 Drs. Winn and Flewellen reviewed a proposal by Worcester State College for a master in business management degree. It is recommended that no new graduate programs be initiated until they can be offered by the business faculty as state-supported programs.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

1. Introduction

The two teams of two members each reviewed the programs of the 15 public community colleges during the period February 24, 1985, through March 1, 1985. The Eastern Region team was comprised of Dr. H. H. Mitchell and Dr. K. E. Wright. The Western Region team was comprised of Dr. J. D. Palmer and Dr. W. C. Flewellen, Jr., Chairman. Vitae of the visiting team members are included as Appendix A. Visits were limited to one-half day at each college. However, prior to the visits, team members received information from the colleges. The form for guidance in preparing the data is included in Appendix B. The Eastern Region team was responsible for providing its assessment to the chairman, who was responsible for preparing the final reports. Copies of the reports to the chairman by the Eastern Region team were shared with the colleges but are not included as appendices to each of the final reports for the college visited by the Eastern Region team.

Guidance to the team, both verbal and written, was provided by staff of the Board of Regents office.

An exit interview with members of staff of the Board of Regents was held at the conclusion of the visits.

It should be noted that visits were extremely short. There was sufficient time to reconcile inconsistencies found in the written reports provided. The suggestions of problems could not be followed up. Furthermore, the written reports were often incomplete and incompatible data were

reported. Nevertheless, these reports should be useful as an indication of problems that need further study and conclusions of the team that are based upon incorrect data can be clarified.

The community colleges appear to be doing a good job. The qualities of their leadership, faculties, curricula and facilities are generally very good. There appears to be some lack of understanding of the role of the community college.

Students

Student demand for programs varied widely according to the data provided. The average percent increase in applications from the fall of 1981 to the fall of 1983 was 14 percent. However, the range was from -18 percent to +143 percent. See Table I. Enrollment, headcount, increased only 10 percent for the 15 colleges; yet FTE enrollments in the day program increased 16 percent. In the DCE program, FTE students decreased 4 percent.

The ranges of percentages among the 15 colleges are extreme. Enrollment changes ranged from -8 percent to +40 percent, a 600 percent variation. For FTE day students the range was from -11 percent to +78 percent, an 810 percent variation. For combined FTE day and DCE students the range was from -12 percent to +78 percent, a 750 percent variation.

The patterns of changes in applications, enrollments and FTE students are varied and sometimes confusing. For example, Cape Cod Community College had a decrease of 3 percent in applications, an increase of 16 percent in enrollment, an increase of 12 percent in FTE day students and a decrease of 24 percent in FTE-DCE students. This pattern is found for several colleges. The data are sufficiently strange to warrant review for accuracy. If the data are accurate, study of causes and implications is indicated.

Notwithstanding the variety of patterns and the range of colleges' experiences, overall student demand for business programs in the community colleges is increasing, especially in the day programs, and this despite the demographics for Massachusetts.

Little data was available about the quality of students. However, there appeared to be increasing numbers who needed remedial courses. The open-admission policy for public community colleges means that student bodies contain a wide variety of competencies. Many of the community colleges have not moved to lighten the effect of the open door policy. Remedial testing is often voluntary, as is completion of remedial courses. Concurrent enrollment in remedial and college courses is common. These practices surely lower the quality of the educational experience provided.

Colleges generally believed that their graduates performed well at senior institutions.

Most of the institutions had done little to develop a placement function, as opposed to a career counseling function. Students appeared to be unaware of the placement services that the colleges might have provided and were generally satisfied with the assistance they received. Increased emphasis on placement, bringing the student and the employer together, should be extremely beneficial to students and greatly improve relationships with the business community.

Placement data was provided for 36 programs. See Table V. The average percentage of graduates who found employment in their major field of study was 53 percent. The range was from 15 to 100 percent. Data for 8 transfer track programs indicated that the percentages that transferred

to a senior institution ranged from 46 to 100 percent. For career track programs the percentages ranged from 0 to 56 percent.

Program

The transfer track curriculums generally approximated the recommended model curriculum. The recommended model curriculum includes only two requirements that can create problems upon transfer to an AACSB accredited senior institution. The recommendation that transfer students complete management and marketing does not conform to the AACSB guidelines which state that advanced courses, such as these two, should be taken in the last two years. Advanced courses completed in the first two years are supposed to be validated before acceptance of the credits. Beyond these two courses, no problems should arise from the model curriculum or the transfer track curriculums of the community colleges unless electives are used to take advanced business courses. Recommended adjustments to the recommended model curriculum are given later in the section captioned "Major Problems and Recommendations."

Indicators of capacity of the programs to absorb more students without additional faculty are average class size, student-faculty ratio and faculty teaching loads. Average class sizes averaged 29. The median was 30. The range was 19 to 33. On this basis alone, as would be expected, some schools could absorb more students. See Table VI. Student-faculty ratios for the day programs averaged 25 to 1. The median was between 20 to 1 and 23 to 1. The range was 10 to 1 to 57 to 1. See Table VII. Teaching loads averaged 23 teaching credit hours. The median was 23. The range was 19 to 25. See Table XI. However, day faculty also taught a maximum of one additional course per term in the DCE program. In community colleges outside of Massachusetts the teaching load is more often 30 hours than 23.

From the reported data it appears that many of the colleges could absorb additional students with little additional cost. However, the data contain peculiarities that call for additional study. Some with low student-faculty ratios have high average class sizes. For example, Greenfield data as reported indicated a student-faculty ratio of 13 to 1; however, class size was 30. The 21-hour average teaching load may account for this situation. Roxbury data indicated a 35 to 1 student-faculty ratio, an average class size of 19 and an average teaching load of 19 hours. These data are not compatible. The report for each college addresses ability to absorb more students.

If data are correct, the following colleges might be able to absorb more students, after further study: Capd Cod, Greenfield, Massachusetts Bay, Mount Wachusett, North Shore, and Springfield.

The business programs appear to be meeting the needs of the communities in terms of curriculums. However, surveys of graduates indicated that only 53 percent of the graduates found employment in the field in which they majored. See Table V. Many other factors affect placement of graduates; however, the low percentage appears to be cause for concern and for investigation. The curriculums may be the right ones and the lack of placement effort may be a problem.

Only three of the colleges were judged to have adequate computer hardware and computer competent faculty. See Table XIII. Most of the colleges are struggling to get the hardware and software. With leadership, faculty competency should follow acquisition of hardware and software.

Service programs for the community have generally been made the responsibility of the DCE programs, and the business faculty are only minimally involved. Although DCE may adequately serve with non-credit

programs, the business faculty lose the contacts and thus may not stay sufficiently attuned to the needs of their degree-seeking students.

As indicated earlier, the transfer track curriculums approximate the recommended model curriculum and that few transfer problems should be encountered. However, a problem does exist in that a high percentage of career track program graduates enroll in senior institutions. The average percentage enrolling in senior institutions for the programs that provided data was 31. The range was from 0 to 56 percent. See Table V. More emphasis on advising might move some of these students into the transfer track programs.

Faculty

. Average class sizes, student-faculty ratios and average teaching loads indicate that most of the colleges have an adequate quantity of faculty. See Tables VI, VII, VIII and XI. If the data reported are accurate, attention should be given to Bristol, Bunker Hill, Quinsigamond and Roxbury.

Ninety (90) percent of the full-time faculties have earned advanced degrees, and seventy-six (76) percent of the DCE faculty (for the nine colleges that provided data) have earned them. Berkshire and Bunker Hill, with 55 percent and 62 percent respectively, are the only two that have fewer faculty with advanced degrees than is satisfactory. See Table IX.

Only 17 percent of the FTE day faculty are part-time. The range is from 2 to 34 percent. See Table X.

One of the significant problems found among most of the colleges is the lack of funds for professional development of the faculty and the lack of programs and incentives for faculty development. All three, funds, programs and incentives, are needed.

Faculty at most institutions are not concerned about use of new instructional technologies. Some colleges use computer assisted instruction and video for remedial courses. Few faculty are computer competent. Action to remedy this lack of competency is needed.

Resources

Table XIII indicates the reviewers' opinions about the adequacy of resources for libraries, computers, placement, professional development and audio-visual aids. In general, libraries were adequate, computers inadequate, placement inadequate and professional development, inadequate. Audio-visual aids appeared to be in adequate supply but inadequate usage.

Secretarial support appeared inadequate for most business programs; however, few faculties complained about lack of support.

Tables XIV and XV indicate the dollars budgeted per FTE student in the day and DCE programs. No benchmarks outside the system are available for comparison; however, the ranges ($397 to $1,265 for day and $344 to $847 for DCE) appear to call for study. The average for day programs was $826; for DCE, $504. This disparity is merely another indication that the quality of DCE programs is low compared with that of day programs.

Salaries for tenured faculty for the 12 schools that provided data had a range of only $24,746 to $29,154, a spread of only 18 percent. The average of average salaries was $26,461. For non-tenured faculty the average of averages was $18,850. The range was $15,877 to $22,113, a spread of 39 percent.

Facilities

Facilities were generally modern and good. Only Roxbury, Northern Essex and Bristol appear to need significant improvement.

Overall Questions for Evaluators

1. How best can the Regents utilize available resources?

   The expansion of some programs and the contraction of others may be indicated. New specialties should be permitted to develop in existing programs as conditions change (the infusion of computers, etc.) after careful study. Consortium arrangements on libraries, professional development seminars, and the like may be useful. They may be less efficient in degree programs.

2. Are the programs meeting current needs for articulation and/or career mobility?

   Transfer track programs appear satisfactory with few changes suggested. Advising and other factors appear to be creating problems in that high percentages of career track program graduates enroll in senior institutions. Lack of placement service appears to be a factor causing the low percentage, 56 percent, of graduates that find employment in the field of their major study.

3. Should there be a single "model" transfer program for community colleges?

   Yes. Programs of accredited schools of business are very similar for the first two years. The American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business standards provide guidance that will eliminate transfer problems. The first two years should be similar at all community colleges for transfer track programs. Only minor variations/adjustments to the recommended model curriculum are suggested in the section captioned "Major Problems and Recommendations."

4. Should new instructional technologies be utilized more?

   More emphasis appears to be needed in integrating the use of new instructional technology in business curricula. Students should become familiar with computer applications, televisions and other media.

5. Given the number of educational institutions in Massachusetts relative to its size and population, additional external degree programs do not appear to be needed.

Major Problems and Recommendations

The problems addressed below appeared to be significant. They are not addressed in a perceived order of significance.

1. A wide variety of student competencies is found in many classes. Open admissions, together with a lack of strong remedial programs, appear to exacerbate this problem. Given the open admissions policies it is recommended that all colleges require remedial testing and the completion of remedial courses prior to enrollment in college courses. This course of action may deter some of the poorer students from continuing, but it should significantly enhance the quality of the education provided for the better prepared students.

2. Placement activity is primarily career counseling. It is recommended that consideration be given to initiating placement programs that seek out employers and bring students into contact with them. This activity will certainly benefit students and should increase and improve community contacts with the college.

3. The transfer model curriculum suggests management and marketing and permits election of advanced business courses. It is recommended that AACSB guidelines be followed more closely. A curriculum that follows AACSB guidelines and that would provide

a firm foundation for further study is suggested below.

General Education Requirements		Common Business Requirements	
English Composition	6	Accounting	6
Science/Math	9	Economics	6
Behavioral/Social Science	9	Legal Environment of Business	3
Humanities/Fine Arts	9	Statistics or Quant. Analysis	3
		Intro. to Computer Usage	3
		Business Communications	3
	33		24

Other Non-business Courses:

Speech 3

4. Business faculty are not involved in service to the community, either through non-credit programs or advisory committees. It is recommended that study of the division of responsibilities for service programs be undertaken to devise ways to involve day faculty. It is further recommended that incentives be provided for day faculty involvement.
5. The range of dollars budgeted per FTE students is too great. Study to determine an optimum level, given total resources, is indicated. Colleges should be told to review their internal allocations. The disparity of resources per DCE FTE student compared with those for the day program deserves more attention, and efforts to improve the DCE situation are needed.

6. There appears to be no philosophy on maximum teaching loads. Present practices appear to be a mixture of contractual maxima for day faculty, which are low by community college practices elsewhere. This 12-hour limit appears to permit day faculty to earn a few extra dollars by teaching in the DCE programs for very low pay. It also allows the DCE to get good teaching from day faculty for very low pay.

   The 15-hour load of day and DCE courses does not pose problems. However, many faculty also teach at other institutions because the contract permits it, and there is little incentive to spend the time in professional development activities or improvement of teaching.

   It is recommended that study of the possibilities of increasing day loads, providing salaries to compensate for loss of pay for teaching in DCE, merging DCE with day in some fashion and limiting teaching at other institutions be undertaken.

7. Data on applications, enrollments and FTE students have patterns that are disturbing. It is recommended that the data be reviewed for accuracy and that investigations be begun to determine the extent to which the patterns are causing problems.

8. Data for judging quality of students does not appear to be available. It is recommended that data such as high school averages, SAT/ACT scores, percentages needing remedial courses and the like be collected. Better college management should result if they are used properly.

9. Career track program students transfer to business administration programs at senior institutions in great numbers. This results in a poor program fit. It is recommended that greater emphasis be placed on early advising to insure a smoother articulation for these students.

10. The separation of DCE from the day program and the requirement that it be self-sufficient are major factors that contribute to poor quality DCE programs. They are taught by part-time faculty. The courses often differ from those of the day program, and there are fewer support services and few resources.

    It is recommended that efforts be made to remove the self-sustaining feature of DCE and end the separation from the day program.

11. There are no satisfactory programs for professional development of faculty. It is recommended that resources be sought for travel and for in-house or systemwide programs. Also, incentives (rewards, recognition) are needed. Those in place appear to be insufficient. Plans should be developed for each college.

12. Most colleges lack computer hardware and software, and faculty and students do not appear to be computer competent. Many colleges have plans that should improve their situations. It is recommended that efforts to provide "catch-up" funds be made. Programs for faculty in computer usage and integration of computers into business courses should be developed. Curriculums should be reviewed to insure that courses in computer usage are required.

13. Students think that academic advising is poor. Many are advised by non-business faculty who are not knowledgeable. Often written

materials are not clear. It is recommended that more attention be given to improving the quality of advising.

14. The business programs have few advisory committees. It is recommended that a Board level policy on advisory committees be developed. Advisory committees can bring significant benefits to the programs.

15. Little use is made of instructional technology. It is recommended that incentives for use of instructional technology be provided.

TABLE I

STUDENT DEMAND
PERCENTAGE CHANGES IN
APPLICATIONS, HEADCOUNT, FTE STUDENTS[1]

Fall 1981 - Fall 1983	Applications	Enrollments				
		Head-count	FTE Students			
		Day	Day	DCE	Combined	Rank
Berkshire	+ 8	+13	+14	+26	+16	5
Bristol	+ 7	- 1	- 5	-10	- 6	12
Bunker Hill	+ 14	+16	+30	- 2	+20	3
Cape Cod	- 3	+16	+12	-24	- 3	11
Greenfield	- 8	+ 3	+11	- 5	+ 5	6
Holyoke	+ 1	+14	+17	NA	+17	4
Massachusetts Bay	- 5	+ 4	+ 5	NA	+ 5	6
Massasoit	+ 16	+ 5	-12	-14	-13	14
Middlesex	- 6	+20	+67	+ 6	+30	2
Mount Wachusett	+ 22	+17	-11	-13	-12	15
Northern Essex	+ 16	+16	+ 4	+ 1	+ 3	8
North Shore	- 11	+ 5	-11	+14	- 1	10
Quinsigamond	+ 25	- 8	+ 9	-20	- 6	12
Roxbury	+ 30	- 4	+78	NA	+78	1
Springfield	- 18	+40	+25	-23	0	9
TOTALS	+ 5	+10	+11	- 5	+ 6	
Average of percentages	+ 14	+10	+16	- 4	+ 9	
Ranges of percentages	-18/+ 30	-8/+40	-11/+78	-24/+26	-12/+78	
High Range as a % of Low	651%	600%	810%	208%	750%	

[1]See Tables II, III and IV for supporting data.
[2]Day and DCE.

TABLE II

STUDENT APPLICATIONS--DAY[1]
FALL 1981 - FALL 1983

	1981-82	1983-84	Percentage Incr.	Percentage Decr.
Berkshire	326	344	8	
Bristol	361	387	7	
Bunker Hill	414	471	14	
Cape Cod	494	480		3
Greenfield	228	210		8
Holyoke	607	614	1	
Mass. Bay	536	511		5
Massasoit	714	825	16	
Middlesex	576	538		6
Mt. Wachusett	220	268	22	
Northern Essex	690	799	16	
North Shore	353	313		11
Quinsigamond	322	404	25	
Roxbury	308	400	30	
Springfield	490	401		18
TOTALS	6639	6965	5	
Average of Percentages			+29%	

[1]Data difficult to interpret

TABLE III

STUDENT ENROLLMENTS--DAY
(HEADCOUNT)
FALL 1981 - FALL 1983

	Fall 1981	Fall 1983	Percentage Incr.	Percentage Decr.
Berkshire	344	389	13	
Bristol	421	417		1
Bunker Hill	491	569	16	
Cape Cod	428	496	16	
Greenfield	225	231	3	
Holyoke	835	954	14	
Mass. Bay	536	555	4	
Massasoit	759	799	5	
Middlesex	331	397	20	
Mt. Wachusett	335	391	17	
Northern Essex	775	896	16	
North Shore	499	522	5	
Quinsigamond	396	363		8
Roxbury	618	593		4
Springfield	286	322	16	
TOTALS	7279	7971	10	
Average of Percentages			+11%	

TABLE IV

FTE STUDENTS
DAY AND DCE
FALL 1981 - FALL 1983

	DAY			DCE			TOTALS DAY AND DCE		
	Fall 1981	Fall 1983	Percent Change	Fall 1981	Fall 1983	Percent Change	Fall 1981	Fall 1983	Percent Change
Berkshire	251	285	+14	61	77	+26	312	362	+16
Bristol	546	518	- 5	163	147	-10	709	665	- 6
Bunker Hill	404	527	+30	203	199	- 2	607	726	+20
Cape Cod[1]	153	172	+12	119	91	-24	272	263	- 3
Greenfield[1]	169	188	+11	107	102	- 5	276	290	+ 5
Holyoke	448	525	+17	NA	NA		448	525	+17
Mass. Bay	326	343	+ 5	NA	NA		326	343	+ 5
Massasoit	399	350	-12	189	163	-14	588	513	-13
Middlesex	218	359	+65	331	352	+ 6	549	711	+30
Mt. Wachusett	252	223	-11	135	117	-13	387	340	-12
Northern Essex	413	430	+ 4	216	219	+ 1	629	649	+ 3
North Shore	398	352	-11	276	314	+14	674	666	- 1
Quinsigamond	196	214	+ 9	208	166	-20	404	380	- 6
Roxbury	190	338	+78	NA[2]	NA		190	338	+78
Springfield	214	268	+25	227	175	-23	441	443	NC
TOTALS	4577	5092	+11	2235	2122	- 5	6812	7214	+ 6
Averages	305	339	+11	186	177	- 5	454	481	+ 6

[1]Data not provided for business administration transfers.

[2]DCE enrollments (headcount) increased from 497 in 1981-82 to 694 in 1982-83.

TABLE V

STUDENT PLACEMENT
1982-83

College	Track	# Students Surveyed	Employed in Major		Percent Enrolled in Senior Institutions		
			Percent	Rank	Transfer Track	Career Track	Transfer/Career Data Combined
Berkshire	Bus. Admin.	40	18	35	55		
	Bus. Careers	33	30	29		30	
	Hotel & Restaurant	18	60	14		20	
Bristol	Bus. Admin.	63	35	25			33
Bunker Hill	Bus. Admin.	91	68	13			19
	Hotel, Rest. & Travel	21	69	11			24
Cape Cod	Bus. Admin.	15	20	33	73		
	Accounting	4	--		100		
	Management	9	56	15			33
	Accounting	8	75	8		12	
	Hotel/Restaurant	23	48	20			48
	Retail Management	14	79	7			7
Greenfield	Accounting	8	33	26		0	
	Management	18	50	16			0
	Marketing	8	33	26		33	
	Bus. Admin.	16	20	32	100		
	Production Management	3	33	26		0	
Holyoke	Hospitality	14	50	16			29
	Retail Management	32	75	8			6
	Accounting	34	38	23			38
	Bus. Admin.	122	44	21			30
	Bus. Studies	26	15	36	81		
Mass. Bay	General Business	54	NA			36	
	Accounting	33	NA			54	
	Retail Management	4	100	1		33	
	Mgt. & Bus. Tech.	73	NA		70		

TABLE V, (continued)...

College	Track	# Students Surveyed	Employed in Major		Percent Enrolled in Senior Institutions		
			Percent	Rank	Transfer Track	Career Track	Transfer/Career Data Combined
Massasoit	Bus. Admin.	249	30	29			56
Middlesex	Bus. Admin.	99	30	29			41
Mt. Wachusett	Bus. Admin.	36	36	24	46		
	Bus. Technology	76	50	16		27	
Northern Essex		NA	NA		NA	NA	
North Shore	Business	125(1)	70	10			44
	Bus. Career		88	4			
	Accounting	24	90	3			50
	Business	26(2)	NA		69		
	Insurance	1	100	1		100	
	Management	59	80	6		31	
	Marketing	13	69	11		46	
	Real Estate	2	50	16		0	
Quinsigamond	Bus. Technology	35	40	22			40
Roxbury	Bus. Admin.	99	23	32			47
Springfield	All programs	55	84	5			29
Average			53 (36)				30 (19)
Range			15/100				0/56
High range as a % of low			667%				--

[1] Business career data is included in business data.

[2] Business transfer is included in business data.

TABLE VI

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE
(APPROXIMATIONS)
FALL 1983

	Day		DCE	
	Hours	Rank	Hours	Rank
Berkshire	30	6	12	1
Bristol	30	6	20	3
Bunker Hill	30	6	22	5
Cape Cod	25	3	24	7
Greenfield	30	6	21	4
Holyoke	33	14	NA	
Massachusetts Bay	30	6	NA	
Massasoit	28	4	26	9
Middlesex	32	13	23	6
Mt. Wachusett	33	14	25	8
Northern Essex	28	4	35	11
North Shore	24	2	NA	
Quinsigamond	30	6	27	10
Roxbury	19	1	NA	
Springfield	30	6	19	2
Average	29		25	
Ranges	19-33		12-35	

TABLE VII

STUDENT-FACULTY RATIOS--DAY
FALL 1983

	Ratios	Rank
Berkshire	20/1	7
Bristol	57/1	15
Bunker Hill	29/1	12
Cape Cod	10/1	1
Greenfield	13/1	2
Holyoke	25/1	9
Massachusetts Bay	19/1	6
Massasoit	23/1	8
Middlesex	25/1	9
Mt. Wachusett	18/1	5
Northern Essex	21/1	11
North Shore	15/1	3
Quinsigamond	40/1	14
Roxbury	35/1	13
Springfield	17/1	4
Average	25/1	
Range	10/57	

TABLE VIII

STUDENT-FACULTY RATIOS--DCE[1]
FALL 1983

	Number of Faculty Headcount						
	No.	No. Master's	No. Doctorates	FTE	FTE Students	Student-Faculty Ratios	Rank
Berkshire	8	NA	NA	1.875	77	41/1	8
Bristol	31	21	4	7.875	147	19/1	4
Bunker Hill	NA	--	--	NA	199	NA	
Cape Cod	28	9	1	6.100	91	15/1	2
Greenfield	17	8	2	4.874	102	21/1	5
Holyoke	NA	--	--	--	NA	NA	
Mass. Bay	NA	--	--	--	NA	NA	
Massasoit	12	9	1	2.625	163	62/1	9
Middlesex	37	27	4	8.925	352	39/1	6
Mt. Wachusett	NA	--	--	NA	117	NA	
Northern Essex	36	14	4	5.519	219	40/1	7
North Shore	69	52	6	22.0	314	14/1	1
Quinsigamond	28	22	3	NA	174	NA	
Roxbury	NA	--	--	NA	NA	NA	
Springfield	34	28	6	10.9	175	16/1	3
Averages						30	
Range						14-62	

[1]Calculated from teaching loads provided in vitae. Data often appeared incomplete.

TABLE IX

FACULTY WITH ADVANCED DEGREES
DAY AND DCE
1983 - 1984

	DAY FACULTY (HEADCOUNT)[1]							DCE FACULTY (HEADCOUNT)[1]				
	No.	No. M's.	% M's.	No. D's.[2]	% D's.	Totals with Advanced Degrees Percent	Rank	No.	No. M's.	No. D's.[2]	Totals with Advanced Degrees Percent	Rank
Berkshire	11	10	55	0	0	91	12	8	NA	NA	NA	
Bristol	7	6	86	1	14	100	1	31	21	4	81	6
Bunker Hill	18	10	56	1	6	62	15	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Cape Cod	14	12	86	1	7	93	10	28	9	1	36	9
Greenfield	13	11	85	2	15	100	1	17	8	2	59	7
Holyoke	19	16	63	4	21	84	14	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Mass. Bay	24	19	79	4	17	96	9	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Massasoit	12	10	83	2	17	100	1	12	9	1	83	5
Middlesex	14	10	71	4	29	100	1	37	27	4	84	3
Mt. Wachusett	14	12	86	1	7	93	10	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Northern Essex	13	11	85	2	15	100	1	36	14	4	50	8
North Shore	17	15	88	2	12	100	1	69	52	6	84	3
Quinsigamond	9	8	89	1	11	100	1	28	22	3	89	2
Roxbury	7	6	86	0	0	86	13	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Springfield	12	10	83	2	17	100	1	34	28	6	100	1
TOTALS	204	166	81	27	13	90		292	190	31	76	
Averages	14	11	80	2	15	90					74	
Ranges			55/89		0/21	62/100					36/100	
Hi Range as a % of Low			162%		--	182%					278%	

[1] Per vitae

[2] Ph.D., Ed.D., JD

TABLE X

PART-TIME FACULTY--DAY
1983-84

	FTE Total[1]	FTE Part-time[1]	Percent Part-time	Rank
Berkshire	16.125	3.125	19	8
Bristol	9.067	2.067	23	10
Bunker Hill	18.000	NA	NA	
Cape Cod	16.583	2.583	16	6
Greenfield	14.250	1.250	9	4
Holyoke	20.750	1.750	8	2
Mass. Bay	18.250	6.250	34	14
Massasoit	15.500	3.500	23	10
Middlesex	14.250	.250	2	1
Mt. Wachusett	12.416	2.500	20	9
Northern Essex	15.708	2.708	17	7
North Shore	23.500	6.500	28	13
Quinsigamond	9.750	.750	8	2
Roxbury	7.750	.750	10	5
Springfield	16.000	4.000	25	12
TOTALS	227.899	37.983	17	
Range			2/34	

[1]Calculated from vitae

TABLE XI

TEACHING LOADS--DAY
FOR THE
ACADEMIC YEAR 1983-84

	Teaching Hours[1]		
	Averages	Rank	Ranges
Berkshire	25	13	21-30
Bristol	24	8	18-30
Bunker Hill	26	14	24-30
Cape Cod	24	8	12-34
Greenfield	21	2	8-24
Holyoke	23	4	18-27
Mass. Bay	NA		NA
Massasoit	23	4	19-24
Middlesex	24	8	24-27
Mt. Wachusett	21	2	12-27
Northern Essex	23	4	19-32
North Shore	24	8	21-27
Quinsigamond	24	8	18-27
Roxbury	19	1	12-24
Springfield	23	4	17-28
AVERAGE OF AVERAGES	23		
RANGE OF AVERAGES	19/25		
HIGH RANGE AS A % OF LOW RANGE	136%		

[1]Teaching credit hours compiled from vitae. Many faculty members also taught in DCE.

TABLE XII

SALARY DATA
DAY FACULTY
1983-84

	All Faculty		Tenured Faculty		Non-tenured Faculty	
	Average	Rank	Average	Rank	Average	Rank
Berkshire	$21,969	10	$29,154	1	$19,274	6
Bristol	NA		NA		NA	
Bunker Hill	$21,118	12	$25,259	9	$19,935	4
Cape Cod	$24,390	5	$26,759	5	$21,435	2
Greenfield	$23,228	9	$25,773	6	$20,682	3
Holyoke	$21,477	11	$25,071	10	$15,952	11
Mass. Bay	$24,746	2	$24,746	12	NA	
Massasoit	$23,880	7	$28,317	3	$16,668	10
Middlesex	$20,459	13	$25,269	8	$18,855	7
Mt. Wachusett	$24,709	3	$29,125	2	$15,877	12
Northern Essex	$25,261	1	$27,703	4	$18,748	8
North Shore	$24,576	4	NA		NA	
Quinsigamond	$24,167	6	$25,511	7	$19,466	5
Roxbury	$17,200	14	NA		$17,200	9
Springfield	$23,709	8	$24,848	11	$22,113	1
AVERAGE OF AVERAGES	$22,921		$26,461		$18,850	
RANGE OF AVERAGES	$17,200/$25,261		$24,746/$29,154		$15,877/$22,113	
HI RANGES AS A % OF LOW RANGE	147%		118%		139%	

TABLE XIII

SUPPORT SERVICES[1]
1983-84

	Audio-visual Aids	Computer	Library	Placement	Professional Development
Berkshire	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited
Bristol	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited
Bunker Hill	Good	Adequate	Adequate	Limited	Limited
Cape Cod	Adequate	Limited	Good	Limited	Limited
Greenfield	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Limited	Limited
Holyoke	Adequate	Limited	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate
Mass. Bay	Adequate	Limited	Adequate	Limited	Limited
Massasoit	Adequate	Limited	Adequate	Adequate	Limited
Middlesex	Adequate	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited
Mt. Wachusett	Good	Limited	Adequate	Limited	Adequate
Northern Essex	Adequate	Limited	Adequate	Limited	Limited
North Shore	Good	Limited	Adequate	Limited	Limited
Quinsigamond	Adequate	Limited	Adequate	Limited	Limited
Roxbury	Adequate	Limited	Adequate	Limited	Limited
Springfield	Limited	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Limited

[1] Grades:
(1) Good
(2) Adequate
(3) Limited

TABLE XIV

DOLLARS BUDGETED PER FTE STUDENT
DAY PROGRAM
1983-84

	SCH	FTE Students	Dollars Per FTE Student	Rank
Berkshire	4743	317	$ 849	8
Bristol	7772	518	$ 397	15
Bunker Hill	7899	527	$ 919	7
Cape Cod	2565	171	$1209	3
Greenfield	2815	188	$1265	1
Holyoke	7884	525	$ 831	9
Mass. Bay	5142	343	$ 611	13
Massasoit	5250	350	$ 993	6
Middlesex	5383	359	$ 743	10
Mt. Wachusett	3341	223	$ 665	12
Northern Essex	6452	430	$ 718	11
North Shore	5289	352	$1087	4
Quinsigamond	5802	214	$1236	2
Roxbury	4060	271	$ 427	14
Springfield	4024	268	$ 995	5
AVERAGES	5228	337	$ 863	
RANGE			$397/$1265	
HIGH RANGE AS A % OF LOW			319%	

TABLE XV

DOLLARS BUDGETED PER FTE STUDENT
DCE PROGRAM
1983-84

	SCH	FTE Students	Dollars Per FTE Student	Rank
Berkshire	1155	77	NA	
Bristol	2199	147	$ 480	6
Bunker Hill	2973	199	$ 518	3
Cape Cod	1368	91	$ 459	7
Greenfield	1528	102	$ 344	10
Holyoke	NA	NA	NA	
Mass. Bay	NA	NA	NA	
Massasoit	2448	163	$ 847	1
Middlesex	5289	352	$ 481	5
Mt. Wachusett	1755	117	$ 615	2
Northern Essex	3280	219	$ 385	9
North Shore	4711	314	NA	
Quinsigamond	2607	166	$ 431	8
Roxbury	NA	NA	NA	
Springfield	2624	175	$ 504	4
AVERAGES	2661	177	$ 506	
RANGE			$344/$847	
HIGH RANGE AS A % OF LOW			246%	

STATE COLLEGES

Programs

The state colleges should not plan to expand programs or to develop new specialties within existing programs until the quality of the present programs has been improved. Thus, it is recommended that emphasis should be placed upon quality rather than quantity. Decisions about increasing or decreasing enrollments should reflect the fact that few of the business programs can absorb additional students without increases in resources. State colleges are advised to offer only "mainstream" options in business. These options are accounting, finance, marketing, management and quantitative analysis, often called management science.

The present MBA and other masters in business should not be continued at their present inadequate level of quality. They should be given immediate attention. Problems include: 1) appropriate funding to assure adequate funding of faculty and resources, 2) funding for faculty support services, 3) the general posture toward research, 4) attitudes toward teaching at more than one institution, 5) separation of the graduate program from the business program and the requirement that the graduate program be self-sustaining.

The use of video, both tapes and live, should be considered as a vehicle for improving instruction. Attention should also be given to the use of computers for teaching. At present, only the teaching of use of computers is given attention. In general, both faculty and students need greater competency in using new technologies.

Students

The state colleges are in a position to fulfill the strong demand for degree programs in business at the bachelors and masters levels. They are attracting students with an average SAT score slightly above the national average score for students who expressed an intention to study business. See Table I. There appears to be a demand for graduates by business firms, largely in Massachusetts and nearby states, although estimated salary offers are below average offers nationally. See Table II. Projections of enrollments to 1987-88 indicate the belief that demand for programs in business will be stronger than demand predicted for all disciplines of all state colleges. See Table III. On the whole, state college projections for buisness appear reasonable.

Faculty

Faculty are generally student oriented. They need to increase awareness of collegiate education for business as it is found outside their institutions. In collegiate education for business the Ph. D. degree in business or a closely related field is recognized as terminal for teaching business courses. The J.D. degree is recognized as terminal for teaching business law. At the minimum level for accreditation only 50 percent of the FTE faculty need have terminal degrees for undergraduate programs and 75 percent for masters programs. Of the 238 AACSB accredited programs as of 1983-84, approximately 50 (21 percent) were state college type institutions. Many other such institutions are approaching the

minimum. Acquisition of faculties of which 50 percent hold terminal degrees is not unattainable.

The state colleges reported 112.2 FTE faculty in 1983-84. Only 14.8 (13 percent) held terminal degrees. See Table IV. Yet many of the state college administrators stated that they could pay the market salary for doctorates in business. There are other factors, other than salary, that have impact on the ability of state colleges to attract and retain qualified faculty.

A major impediment is the use of across-the-board raises with little recognition of merit. The few attempts which recognize superior achievement, such as the distinguished service awards, appear less than effective. A stronger merit system would improve the retention of the few faculty who earn the doctorate after initial employment in a state college.

A second major impediment is the way in which graduate programs are structured. The State requires that graduate programs be self-sustaining and that they be offered in the evening through the evening division rather than the business division. Since the State requires that graduate programs in the state colleges be operated at no cost to the Commonwealth, payments to regular faculty for "overload" teaching are minimal. Many part-time faculty also are used and paid very low salaries. Thus, the system structure promotes use of faculty who generally are not graduate level faculty, and there is little or no full-time faculty to develop the program and to give it cohesiveness. The demand for faculty with business doctorates is such that very few will accept positions where these conditions exist.

A third significant factor is the lack of support. See Table VI. There are almost no funds for travel. Three of the state colleges allocated less than $20 per faculty member. It is difficult to determine whether the lack of funds for travel is the cause of lack of participation in professional organizations (see Table V), or the effect of the possible lack of faculty interest. Nevertheless, new faculty with doctorates are not likely to accept employment where there are no funds for travel.

Secretarial support for faculty is wholly inadequate. See Table VII. The number of faculty per secretary ranges from a low of 16.3 to 31.2. Perceptions in collegiate education for business are that ratios of 7/1 are more nearly proper. Again, the cause/effect is difficult to determine. See Table VI. Currently, the secretarial workload is largely composed of typing examinations and handling general administrative tasks because few faculty are involved in research and publication. Faculty with doctorates are not likely to accept employment at institutions that provide so little secretarial support.

There appear to be no strong professional development programs for faculty. Present faculty state that they would work toward the doctorate if there were programs within commuting distance, but the University of Massachusetts at Amherst will not admit students who plan to attend part-time. Although few institutions in the country provide doctoral programs within commuting distance, (Faculty make their own opportunities) an effort to provide such a program to enable those of the present faculty an opportunity might be

worthwhile. The faculty were hired under standards that did not require the doctorate. Attempts at improvement of the quality of the faculty indicate a change of the standards. A temporary program, part-time and summer, offered by the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, would prove worthwhile. Yet, unless the problems cited above are resolved, many of those who earn the doctorate are certain to leave the state college system. However, faculty should be encouraged to obtain additional appropriate education even if not enrolled in a doctoral program.

In '83-'84 faculty salary levels were lower than those at public non-accredited schools with membership in AACSB. See Table VIII. However, salaries were increased an average of 8.5% in 84-85. In order to attract new faculty with doctorates salary levels will need to improve even more.

The state colleges do not require that faculty earn the doctorate in order to get tenure and promotions. The contract also appears to limit the time that the college can demand of faculty to teaching four courses and specified office hours. This limitation, together with the inadequacy of the merit pay system insures that faculty will teach at other institutions and work in the private sector. These practices by faculty are unacceptable except in carefully controlled and limited amounts.

Libraries

Libraries appear minimally adequate for undergraduate programs in business. Many consortiums are already in place and appear to be a reasonable way to resolve library needs.

More attention should be given, however, to required library usage by students.

Facilities

Quality of facilities varied widely. They were generally adequate; however, some institutions need to address the provision of better office space. Few have sufficient numbers of classrooms that will seat 200 students. See Table IX. Small classes are nice but not necessary in all subjects, especially those for which lecturing is the common method of teaching. Larger class sizes would permit use of funds now used for faculty salaries to be used for secretarial support, travel, professional development of faculty and/or higher salaries that might attract doctorally qualified faculty.

Placement

Placement activity is largely career counseling activity rather than placement activity. See Table II. Students should benefit from more emphasis on placement. Furthermore, the colleges would receive benefits from the contacts with the business community.

Curriculum

Undergraduate curricula only approximate those recommended in the AACSB standards. It is suggested that the AACSB be asked to provide consultants for each college to review the curricula and advise on other matters. Costs normally will be only those for expenses of travel, room, meals, etc.

Mathematics requirements are weak in some of the colleges. Students in business need math through introduction to calculus. More competency in quantitative analysis and use of computers is indicated for both students and faculty for most of the state colleges, and more computer hardware and software are needed. More emphasis on basic communications skills, verbal and written, and interpersonal skills is needed.

The state colleges work hard to maintain a liberal arts posture, sometimes to the point of making life in the professional programs more difficult. In some of them the majority of the students are in non-liberal arts programs. Partnership rather than dominance by liberal arts, might be a more useful arrangement for students and faculty.

AACSB standards for business programs require that at least 40 percent of the work be in non-business courses. Most good schools approach 50 percent. Business is a partner with liberal arts--not a transgressor or opponent.

Management/Leadership

Leadership in the state colleges at both college and department levels needs to be more aware of ways to increase quality in collegiate education for business. Department heads, generally, do not get involved regionally or nationally in collegiate education for business organizations and activities. A major orientation program for department chairmen, vice presidents of academic affairs or deans of faculties should be useful. The program would bring knowledgeable deans and faculty from good schools of business to the state and the campuses. Workshops and seminars can be used. Consultants assigned to each institution could be helpful.

A study of state colleges in other states might help overcome the apparent belief that a significant increase in quality is impossible or undesirable. This review is one bit of evidence that accreditation and the image it projects for business programs is a fact of life in collegiate education for business. It cannot be escaped by isolation or intention. Students and parents will eventually judge the schools of Massachusetts by the better schools that they see elsewhere. Already the corporate world is judging the state college programs in Massachusetts by the good (accredited) schools from which they get their future managers.

Convincing leadership that quality, in the national sense, is a worthy goal merely will be frustrating unless most of the barriers raised by legislative and union decree are removed. These barriers include:

1. Graduate programs separated from the business program
2. Graduate programs that must be self-sustaining

3. Across-the-board salary increases
4. Inability to require the terminal doctorate for the awarding of promotion and tenure
5. Lack of control of faculty teaching at other institutions and working in the private sector

There also appear to be some self-made problems. Faculty recruiting effort appears to be limited to placing advertisements in various media. Workshops on recruiting would be helpful. Two other attitudinal problems appear to have negative influence. One is the attitude that educational programs west of the Boston metropolitan area are generally inferior. The other is the attitude that public education in Massachusetts is inevitably inferior to that offered by the independent sector. Hope does not always "spring eternal in the human breast"; sometimes it needs to be planted and nurtured there.

Other problems include the rotation of department chairmen, the appointment of committee members by union officials, the insistence upon very small classes, and the relatively few management prerogatives available in the budget.

Measures of Adequacy of Numbers of Faculty

Table IV lists for each state college three measures of adequacy of the number of FTE faculty:

1. The student faculty ratio
2. The actual FTE faculty compared with the minimum faculty required for AACSB accreditation
3. The actual FTE faculty with terminal qualifications compared with the minimum number required for accreditation.

Table IV does not include overload teaching in divisions of graduate or continuing education or teaching in other institutions. The extent of these activities should be studied to determine their impacts.

Student-faculty ratios range from 18/1 to 23/1. All would be considered good. AACSB standards anticipate a ratio of approximately 25/1 for accreditation. The very good accredited schools approximate 19/1, 20/1.

Comparison of minimum faculty for accreditation with actual faculty reveals that all state colleges except Bridgewater State College exceeded the minimum in 1983-84. Very good schools of business approximate 125 percent to 135 percent of the minimum.

Accreditation requires that 50 percent of the minimum faculty for accreditation at the undergraduate level hold the appropriate doctorate and 75 percent of that for the masters degree level. Only undergraduate hours are included in Table IV. The state college programs are woefully short. Percentages that actual faculty is of minimum range from 0 to 61 percent. The better schools of business approximate 75 to 80 percent.

Measures of Quality of Scholarly Activity

Table V gives the publishing records of faculty at the state colleges. It indicates the number and percent of the faculty who have published articles in refereed journals and books and the total number of such publications.

Few faculty are involved in scholarly research. Given the lack of incentive and the barriers, the record shown in Table V could have been predicted.

Measures of Funding Provided Business Programs

Table VI permits comparison of funding provided the six state colleges' business programs by their colleges. It further permits comparison of funding levels (percent of the college instructional budget) with the share of the college workload (percent of the college student credit hours taught by the business program). It also gives data for secretarial support and funds for travel.

Most business programs teach a larger percentage of the institution's student credit hours than the percent of the institution's instructional budget that they receive. This relationship for the state colleges varies from a budget share 35 percent of the percent share of student credit hours to 82 percent. Eighty-two (82) percent is considered normal; however, in the other colleges there appears to be need for review of allocations.

The data in Table VI show the small percentages of the college secretarial/clerical budget allocated to business programs. North Adams State College is an exception. The reported data are $9,791 for business and only $33,164 for the total institution. These data may not be comparable to those of the other institutions. North Adams State College shows only one secretary for its 18.5 FTE faculty.

Travel funds are virtually nonexistent for four of the colleges. Many of them indicated that they could not pay the expenses of visits of candidates for faculty positions.

Measures of Adequacy of Funding for Business Programs in State Colleges

Table VII relates budgeted funds to FTE faculty and FTE students. It provides insight into the differences among institutions and into the adequacy of funding.

State college dollars per FTE faculty member appear quite low--especially when compared with the public institutions of higher learning in Florida and when compared with three of the universities in Massachusetts. The same can be said of dollars per FTE students.

The levels of support personnel (secretaries) in the state colleges may be adequate for the present level of operation but are unacceptable if quality is to be improved.

Salary Data by Rank

Table VIII indicates that differences among colleges exist. Numbers of faculty in each rank are so small that conclusions about the significance of the difference do not appear to be warranted.

The 83-84 salaries at most colleges are low compared with AACSB public nonaccredited salary data. The AACSB data are generally for faculties with more doctoral degrees. Given its qualifications, the present faculties of the state colleges do not appear to be underpaid.

Of special significance is the data for hires of new doctorates by nonaccredited AACSB schools. These salary levels for new hires exceed those for the assistant professor rank and, for most state colleges, those for the associate professor rank.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. No expansion or new specialties within existing programs should be approved until the quality of current programs has been improved.

2. A program that will result in readiness to apply for accreditation should be developed for each state college.

3. Financing and organizational reporting lines for graduate programs in business administration should be restructured.

4. Support for faculty development and secretarial services should be increased.

5. The ability to require the doctorate for tenure and promotion, the ability to award significant merit raises and the ability to exercise more control over faculty time should be given high priority in contract negotiations.

6. The offering of a systemwide MBA program by use of live television or videotapes should be considered.

7. Computers should be integrated into the course work in business. A ratio of twenty (20) students per terminal should be considered as a minimum level of adequacy. Every effort should be made to provide appropriate computer hardware and software.

8. Placement activities should be increased.

9. Appropriate funding should be made available to effect these improvements.

TABLE I

STATE COLLEGES
QUALITY OF STUDENTS
AVERAGE SAT SCORES

	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	
						Score	Rank
Bridgewater State College					810	840	5
Fitchburg State College			937	943	906	875	3
North Adams State College	987	926	920	900	930	903	2
Salem State College	866	849	850	850	885	845	4
Westfield State College					876	917	1
Worcester State College	843	833	810	787	796	830	6
Average	872	869	879	870	867	868	
U.S.--Average score for students who expressed intention to study business						852	

TABLE II

STATE COLLEGES
DATA ON PLACEMENT ACTIVITY

	Placement Office Activity % to:[1] Career Counseling	Placement	Estimated Companies Recruiting on Campus	Estimated Average Salary Offers
Bridgewater State College	80	20	25	$17,000
Fitchburg State College	70	30	40	$15,000/$17,000
North Adams State College	85	15	5	$15,000/$17,000
Salem State College	80	20	15/20	$15,000/$17,000
Westfield State College	65	35	35	$15,000
Worcester State College	80	20	10	$16,000/$17,000
Nationally (per College Placement Council):				
Accounting				$19,464
Business				$18,084
Marketing				$17,616

[1] Estimated

TABLE III

STATE COLLEGES
ENROLLMENT DATA

	% of College SCH	% Change 1978-79 to 1984-85	% Change Projected to 1987-88	1984-85 Enrollment	Projected Enrollment 1987-88
Bridgewater State College		+259[a]	+18	1251	1475
Fitchburg State College	11.9	+413	- 2	605	590
North Adams State College	18.9	- 16	+ 2	650	660
Salem State College	12.7	+ 45	-10	1450	1310
Westfield State College	12.7	+239	+13	575	650
Worcester State College	8.8	+ 75	+16	730	850
Regents' projections for all state colleges, all disciplines			- 5[b] to -21		
Average for state colleges	12.6		6	877	922
Total enrollments				5261	5535[c]

[a] Two years only

[b] Range due to different assumptions

[c] Total projection of a 5.2% increase

TABLE IV

STATE COLLEGES
MEASURES OF ADEQUACY OF NUMBER OF FACULTY
AND NUMBER OF APPROPRIATE DOCTORATES

	Student/ Faculty Ratios	Adequacy of Total Faculty			Adequacy of Number of Appropriate Doctorates		
		Minimum FTE Faculty[1]	Actual FTE Faculty	% Actual of Minimum	Minimum[2]	Actual	% Actual of Minimum
Bridgewater State College (1983-84)	23/1	14.75	13.25	90	7.4	0	0
(1984-85)	(29/1)	(25.4)	(19.8)	95	(12.7)	(0)	(0)
Fitchburg State College	23/1	20.7	18.5	119	6.9	1.5	22
North Adams State College	22/1	15.5	18.5	119	6.8	3.3	48
Salem State College	23/1	27.9	30.5	109	12.0	5.0	42
Westfield State College	19/1	14.1	15.9	113	6.1	2.0	32
Worcester State College	18/1	11.8	12.3	104	4.9	3.0	61
TOTALS			112.2		44.1	14.8	34
AACSB Standards--Minimum for Accreditation	25/1						
Very Good Accredited Schools	19/1			128	(3)		

[1]Minimum for accreditation

[2]The minimum is calculated as 50% of the minimum total faculty teaching in the undergraduate program. In addition, there must be doctoral coverage in each of the areas within the field of business.

[3]Very good accredited schools approximate 80% or more of faculty with appropriate doctorates. The comparable percentage for state colleges is 13% (14.8÷112.2). The average % for 9 Florida universities was 69%.

TABLE V

STATE COLLEGES
MEASURES OF SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY
AND QUALITY OF FACULTY
(OTHER THAN TEACHING)
LIFETIME RECORDS

	Bridgewater State College	Fitchburg State College	North Adams State College	Salem State College	Westfield State College	Worcester State College
Chapters in books and articles in refereed journals						
Number of faculty publishing		2			2	4
Percent of faculty publishing		11			13	32
Number of articles		2			8	8
Articles per FTE faculty		.11			.43	.65
Books						
Number of faculty					1	1
Number of books					1	1
Miscellaneous publications						
Number of faculty		4	2	2	5	8
Number of items		9	4	5	8	13
No vitae for:		Charland McAloon McKean			Hiney Poppalardo Tobia	Swanson

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF FUNDING PROVIDED BUSINESS PROGRAMS BY STATE COLLEGES

	Bridgewater State College	Fitchburg State College	North Adams State College	Salem State College	Westfield State College	Worcester State College
Percent of College SCH	7.0%	11.9%	18.9%	12.7%	12.7%	8.8%
% of total instructional budget[1]	3.9%	5.1%	13.0%	7.6%	4.5%	7.2%
% that budget % is of the % of SCH[2]	56%	43%	69%	60%	35%	82%
% of administrative budget	4.1%			4.5%		8.3%
% of instructional staff budget	4.0%	6.9%	12.2%	7.8%	6.5%	7.1%
% of secretarial/clerical budget	5.4%	1.3%	29.5%	6.1%	1.7%	7.8%
% of supplies and materials budget	1.8%	10.0%	7.0%	1.0%	2.8%	9.5%
% of travel budget	.6%	7.0%	1.9%	2.4%	6.7%	12.0%
Total travel budget	$100	$200	$191	$501	$3,000	$2,400
Dollars of travel budget per FTE faculty	$ 7	$ 11	$ 10	$ 16	$ 191	$ 195

[1]Average for 9 Florida universities was 13.6%.

[2]Average for 9 Florida universities was 76%.

TABLE VII

BUDGET RELATIONSHIPS--
FUNDING FOR STATE COLLEGES

	Bridgewater State College	Fitchburg State College	North Adams State College	Salem State College	Westfield State College	Worcester State College	Avg. for 9 Florida Univ.
College instructional budget ($000)	$ 7,617	$ 8,989	$ 2,884	$ 8,689	$ 8,286	$ 5,665	
Business program budget	$300,785	$469,700	$374,000	$664,974	$357,451	$410,405	
Dollars per FTE faculty	$ 22,700	$ 25,389	$ 20,216	$ 21,802	$ 22,914	$ 33,502	$ 44,440
Dollars per FTE student	$ 765	$ 1,113	$ 906	$ 934	$ 936	$ 1,307	$ 2,180
Business program support budget	$ 9,000	$ 2,400	$ 2,416	$ 1,598	$ 5,000	$ 3,160	
Dollars per FTE faculty	$ 705	$ 129	$ 130	$ 52	$ 320	$ 258	$ 6,053
Dollars per FTE student	$ 23	$ 5	$ 6	$ 2	$ 13	$ 10	$ 295
Sec./cler. personnel							
Number	1	$ .75	1	1	1	.75	
FTE fac. per FTE sec./cler.	13.25	24.70	18.5	30.5	31.2	16.30	7.1
Sec./cler. budget	$ 11,860	$ 12,272	$ 9,791	$ 13,638	$ 14,891	$ 11,029	
Dollars per FTE fac.	$ 895	$ 663	$ 529	$ 447	$ 954	$ 900	$ 2,899
Travel budget	$ 100	$ 200	$ 191	$ 501	$ 3,000	$ 2,400	
Dollars per FTE fac.	$ 7	$ 11	$ 10	$ 16	$ 191	$ 195	

TABLE VIII

STATE COLLEGES
SALARY DATA BY RANK

Rank	Bridgewater State College	Fitchburg State College	North Adams State College	Salem State College	Westfield State College	Worcester State College	AACSB--Public Accred.	AACSB--Public Non-Accr
Professor				(3)		(7)	(3341)	(906)
High				$34,623		$32,999	$60,000	$60,000
Mean				$33,271		$30,914	$40,200	$34,800
Low				$31,716		$28,762	$25,000	$25,000
Associate Professor		(2)	(2)	(4)	(1)	(1)	(2768)	(1229)
High		$37,401	$28,456	$28,650	$24,403	$21,190	$50,000	$50,000
Mean		$33,856	$27,639	$26,886	$24,403	$21,190	$32,700	$29,400
Low		$30,311	$26,821	$25,121	$24,403	$21,190	$20,000	$20,000
Assistant Professor	(9)	(7)	(2)	(13)	(5)	(1)	(2998)	(1435)
High	$30,159	$25,500	$27,030	$22,800	$24,582	$23,271	$45,000	$45,000
Mean	$24,728	$22,814	$26,118	$21,483	$22,363	$23,271	$28,700	$24,800
Low	$23,019	$18,904	$25,205	$20,000	$19,648	$23,271	$20,000	$20,000
Instructor		(7)	(10)	(6)	(4)	(1)	(1101)	(660)
High		$19,000	$23,119	$19,465	$23,000	$21,000	$30,000	$30,000
Mean		$18,440	$19,512	$19,058	$20,167	$21,000	$20,500	$19,500
Low		$17,735	$16,743	$18,000	$17,468	$21,000	$15,000	$15,000
Hires of New Doctorates							(242)	(53)
High							$44,000	$37,000
Mean							$29,900	$27,400
Low							$25,000	$25,000

TABLE IX

STATE COLLEGES
AVERAGE CLASS SIZES
SPRING 1984

College	Average Class Size
Bridgewater State College	18/36
Fitchburg State College	21
North Adams State College	28
Salem State College	15
Westfield State College	33
Worcester State College	21

Universities

Introduction:

The Regents have universities and state colleges within commuting distance of almost every resident of Massacnusetts. Each of these institutions has a program in business. There is strong student demand for the business programs at both bachelors and masters levels. However, the number of high school graduates in Massachusetts are expected to decrease, and enrollments in the state colleges and universities may decrease by 1990. Given the regional differences in population growth a review of projections by each institution is indicated. Average student SAT scores for the state colleges is 868, slightly above the national average, 852, for students who intended to study business. The average SAT score for the four universities is 973, which is higher than the national average and that for the state colleges but which is low enough to stimulate efforts to improve ratner than to increase program size significantly. The average SAT score in business programs in 9 selected universities was 1020 with a range of 960 to 1082. The institutions were the University of Georgia, University of Connecticut, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, University of South Carolina, Auburn University, University of Maine, and the Univeristy of Rhode Island.

Program

There appears to be sufficient demand for MBA programs across the state. The quality of those in the state colleges needs improvement. That at Southeastern Massachusetts University is similar to those in the state colleges. None of the state college MBA programs should be expanded until substantial improvement has been achieved in quality of faculty. In fact, MBA programs should be held at present enrollment levels at state colleges and universities (excluding UMA) until the undergraduate programs achieve improvement toward accreditation by the AACSB.

In the interim, a Regents' sponsored MBA on video, like the FEEDS program at the University of Florida, should be studied as a possible method for serving the state at the MBA level with a program of acceptable quality. A curriculum based upon mixture of tape, broadcast and face to face instruction could be developed. Such a program might avoid the separation of graduate work from the discipline and the self-sustaining requirement found in the state colleges. The best of the faculties of the three universities, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, the University of Massachusetts at Boston, and the University of Lowell, might participate in the production of the program. The Regents' admissions standards might be administered by each institution and credit earned at each instition.

The evaluation team found only one other program for which there appeared to be significant demand -- a program in hotel management in the Boston metropolitan area. That program has been addressed in the UMB report. As indicated there, the

UMB faculty is interested in offering a program oriented to management competence. The feasibility of a program oriented to management but with internships or "co-op" opportunities built in to provide the practical aspects might be studied. It is proposed that additional resources will be needed. A consortium arrangement is not recommended. A 2+2 transfer program with selected community colleges should be considered. The market study being done by A. D. Little, Inc. should be reviewed carefully and if developed, the program should become the responsibility of the College of Management.

The team had insufficient time to meet with faculty and students from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst programs in Hotel, Restaurant, and Travel Administration and Sports Management. Furthermore, it lacked familiarity with their contents. A separate review of these programs should be carried out.

At the present time resources should be devoted to quality improvement. Long-term planning should consider a doctoral level program in the Boston metropolitan area. Nationally, the demand for faculty with doctorates in business/management is very strong. The student demand in an area with as many institutions of higher learning as the Boston area might be sufficient to support a modest size doctoral program. The program could be useful by providing easier access to faculty from other public institutions in Massachusetts.

Short-term planning might include consideration of a part-time program at the doctoral level operated by the University of Massachusetts Amherst to provide doctoral courses for the present faculties of the state colleges and Southeastern Massachusetts University, as well as faculty from privately funded institutions. If standards for promotion and raises are changed as they should be, many faculty will be caught in the sense that they accepted employment under one set of conditions and after years spent at an institution must meet other more rigorous standards. They may find also that leaving for two or three years to obtain a doctorate is difficult. Faculty accepting positions after the change of standards should possess the doctoral qualification. Moreover, it may be possible that there is insufficient effective demand for such a part-time program among the present state college and SMU faculties.

Long term planning should consider development of a doctoral program at the University of Massachusetts Boston to serve the metropolitan area.

Until quantum improvements in quality have been achieved, external degree programs should not be considered. The video MBA should be offered through existing institutions for the benefit of those institutions, as well as for benefits for the students.

Curriculums

The curriculums at UMA are accredited; those at UL appear to generally meet AACSB standards. Those at UMB and SMU need adjustment. Use of AACSB consultants is recommended to assist with this process.

The curriculums at all campuses appear to be providing the basis for career mobility. As the universities' (UMB, UL and SMU) reputations improve, more corporations will seek their graduates and the average salary offers to graduates should improve. With the exception of the UMA graduates tney are now below the national average.

Faculty development opportunities should be available to assist faculty in incorporating new instructional technologies into coursework. Faculties need to become more familiar with these new technologies. Mechanisms must be developed to enhance existing proficiencies. Faculty must begin to integrate computer applications into business coursework.

Students

Table I gives average SAT scores for the four universities. The University of Massachusetts at Amherst and the University of Massachusetts at Boston show higher scores in 1983-84 than in 1979-80. At the University of Lowell and Southeastern Massachusetts University scores were lower. All scores were above the national average, 852, for students who expressed interest in business. However, it is believed that scores for students who entered universities would be higher. Scores at UMB, UL and SMU leave room for improvement. Information for business programs at 9 universities shows an average SAT for entering freshmen of 1020 and a range of 960 to 1082. Universities for which data was available were the University of Georgia, University of Connecticut, University of New

Hampshire, University of Vermont, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, University of South Carolina, Auburn University, University of Maine and the University of Rhode Island.

Demand for graduates, except at UMA, appears to be local or, at best, regional which as consistent with the missions of regional public institutions. Again, except for UMA, estimated average salary offers are below national averages. (See Table II.) The placement function generally needs to be oriented more toward placement, as opposed to counseling. More recruiters need to be attracted to the campuses.

Overall 1987-88 projections for enrollment, +3.5 percent over 1984-85, appear reasonable, given the continuing strong interest in education for business, despite Regents' projections for overall enrollment. (See Table III.)

Faculty

Students report that faculty are generally student oriented.

The adequacy of the numbers of faculty is indicated by the low student-faculty ratios. (See Table IV.) The average for the universities is 19 to 1. The AACSB maximum for accreditation approximates 25 to 1; very good schools of business approximate 19 to 1. Nine Florida universities averaged 20/1. The range for the four universities is 13/1 to 24/1. Thirteen (13) to one (1) is exceptional. Class sizes averaging 31 indicate that teaching hour loads of faculty are low. (See Table IX.) Average class sizes for business programs in 9 Florida state universities were 57 for lower division classes and 41 in upper division classes.

Futher indication of the adequacy of numbers of faculty is shown by comparison of actual FTE faculty with the minimum, exceeded the minimum in all universities. The percentage that actual is of minimum ranged from 110 percent to 197 percent. Average was 137 percent. Very good schools of business approximate 135 percent. Nine Florida universities average 128 percent.

The quality of the faculty is indicated, in part, by the percentage who have earned the doctorate. (See Table IV.) This percentage approximates 80 percent in the better schools of business. It was 69 percent for 9 Florida universities. For the 4 Massachusetts Universities it averaged 49 percent. Range was from 13 percent at SMU to 78 percent at UMA. One, SMU, had fewer appropriate doctorates than the minimum for accreditation. Despite the 207 percent for UMB, it has a quality problem in that so many of its faculty are part-time. The average percentage, actual doctorates to minimum, for the 4 universities was 146 percent. For UMA, UMB and UL the average of 174 percent. For 9 Florida universities this average was 171 percent.

Further indication of quality is indicated by selected measures of scholarly productivity. (See Table V.) Some indication of the scholarly productivity of the faculty can be gained from analysis of publications in refereed journals and books published. AACSB standards for accreditation do not offer numerical measures against which performance can be

judged. Its Standard III B, 1984-85 edition, gives general guidance:

"Scholarly productivity includes the quality and extent of research and publication."

"A reasonable cross-section of the faculty should be regularly engaged in research and publication. The scholarly productivity of a faculty offering a graduate program should exceed that of a faculty offering only an undergraduate program."

The range of quantity of publication within the population of accredited schools far exceeds the range from no publication to the minimum acceptable for accreditation. Articles on faculty productivity generally indicate that a faculty average of one article in refereed journals per year is very good. The averages for the four universities as judged by the writer ranged from .70 to .03. The .70, UMA, indicates a good, productive faculty. UL with an average of .30 is deemed productive enough to satisfy an AACSB accreditation team. UMB is questionable, and SMU is deplorable.. The average for 8 Florida universities was .33; 3 of these Florida universities have not achieved AACSB accreditation for their bachelors level program.

Less information is available for books published. The record at UMA is approximately seven per year. The faculty of the College of Business Administration at the University of Georgia (120 FTE) has published between 12 and 20 books per year for each of the past several years.

Publication records need significant improvement at UMB, UL and SMU if they are to be recognized as high quality institutions.

Activity in professional associations is another measure of quality of faculty. (See Table V.) This activity may be judged to some extent by the number of papers presented at national and regional meetings. Little data is available with which to compare this information for the four universities. The range of annual average number of presentations per faculty member is revealing. UMA averaged .58 presentations at national meetings and .17 at regional meetings. The next best average for national meetings was .20, UMB. At UL and SMU this activity was insignificant. Over a two-year period, 8 Florida universities averaged .24 presentations at national meetings and .16 at regional meetings.

Resources

Relative levels of support provided the business programs in the four universities are indicated, in part, by Table VI. Overall support is probably shown best by the percentage relationship of the College budget to the University instructional budget compared with the percentage relationship of the student credit hours taught by the College to the total University student credit hours (a comparison of resources with teaching workloads). This percentage is below 100 in most business schools but it appears exceptionally low at SMU--55 percent--and marginally low at UL, 67 percent. Little data is

available for comparisons; however, the average percentage for 9 Florida universities was 76 percent. Table VI shows that business programs in the universities are receiving a lower percentage of their universities' budgets than they are shouldering of their universities' teaching loads.

Table VII gives additional information about relative funding among the universities.

The dollars of instructional budget per FTE faculty range from $20,315 (SMU) to $45,269 (UMA). For 9 Florida universities the average was $44,440. The Massachusetts universities averaged $35,100. The dollars of instructional budget per FTE student ranged from $940 (SMU) to $2883 (UMB). The average for 9 Florida universities was $2180; for the Massachusetts universities it was $1859.

The range of support budgets per faculty and per student range from the ridiculous to minimum adequacy. For dollars of support budget per FTE faculty, the range was from $169 (SMU) to $1005 (UMA). Florida universities averaged $6053. The average for Massachusetts universities was $648. Dollars of support budget per FTE student ranged from $8 (SMU) to $290 (UMA). For the Florida universities it was $295. The average for the the Massachusetts universities is $96. Budgets for secretarial and clerical assistance are good at UMA (4.6/1) to UMB (5.2/1) but inadequate at UL (12/1) and SMU (12.6/1). A faculty-secretary ratio of approximately 7 to 1 is generally considered adequate. The ratio for the 9 Florida universites was 7.1 to 1.

Dollars of secretarial/clerical budget per FTE faculty provide another way to gain insight. For the four universities the range is from $415 (SMU) to $2889 (UMA); tne average is $1767. For the Florida universities it was $2899.

Unless funds other than those budgeted are used for travel, all travel budgets are inadequate. Those at UMB, UL and SMU represent almost no budget at all; per faculty budgets of $145, $69 and $29 respectively. Budgets at the very good schools will approximate $800 per FTE faculty.

Review of salary data, Table VIII, shows that mean salaries at each rank approximate those for AACSB accredited schools at UMA, UMB, and UL. SMU is significantly low except at the assistant professor level. To attract doctorally qualified faculty, salary levels at SMU will have to be raised.

It is at the "high" salary level that Massachusetts universities are not competitive. High nine-month salary averages for AACSB accredited schools in 1983-84 were above $60,000. See Table VIII. At the University of Georgia they went above $65,000 in 1983-84. 1984-85 data for ten major state universities, three in the Southeast, six in the Midwest, and one in the Southwest show that high salaries for full professors reached $95,000. It is at this level that fine quality and national reputation are largely generated.

Libraries

Based upon materials provided to reviewers, it appears that libraries are adequate at UMA, UMB and UL. Holdings at SMU appear thin, especially those of periodicals. A consortial

arrangement may be the best way to resolve this problem.

Placement

See Table II.

UMB, UL and SMU devote a greater percentage of their efforts to career counseling than do most other state university business placement efforts. More emphasis should be given to placement of graduates. Salary offers, except at UMA, are below national averages.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Focus on quality improvement of programs rather than expansion. The three university programs not accredited should be given a five year period to reach the point of applying for accreditation.

2. SMU must increase the number of doctorates on its' faculty.

3. Beyond accreditation, plans should be developed to attract distinguished faculty to provide role models and leadership, particularly at UMB, UL and SMU.

4. The universities, especially the University of Massachusetts Amherst, should develop plans to provide leadership for the state colleges. Opportunity for enrollment of state college faculty in a state-supported doctoral program is needed. A temporary program at the doctoral level should

be offered by UMA to provide opportunity for the present faculties of the state colleges and SMU. Long-term planning should consider a doctoral level program in the metropolitan area under the auspices of UMB.

5. A Regents' sponsored MBA on video should be studied as an appropriate method for serving the state at the MBA level with a program of acceptable quality.

6. The feasibility of a hotel management program with internships or co-op opportunities at UMB should be studied.

7. Computing resources should be improved to accommodate no more than 20 students/terminal.

8. Incentives to encourage professional development of faculty should be expanded. Secretarial support at UL and SMU should be increased to national average of 7/1 and faculty travel funds should be increased, to support the need for significant improvement in scholarship and publication at UMB, UL and SMU.

9. Funding for these purposes should be made a priority.

TABLE I

UNIVERSITIES*
QUALITY OF STUDENTS
AVERAGE SAT SCORES

	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Univ. of Mass. at Amherst	994	1007	1007	1013	1046	1072
Univ. of Mass., Boston	--	918	947	921	960	961
Univ. of Lowell	971	959	921	951	957	935
S.E. Mass. Univ.	949	937	928	927	923	916
Averages	971	955	951	953	971	973
Averages (State Colleges)	872	869	879	870	867	868
U.S. avg. score for students who expressed an intention to study business						852
*Business programs at nine universities:						
Median						1033
Average						1020
Range						960-1082

*Institutions: University of Georgia, University of Connecticut, University of New Hampshire, University of Vermont, Auburn University, University of Maine, University of Rhode Island, University of South Carolina and University of Massachusetts at Amherst

TABLE II

UNIVERSITIES
DATA ON PLACEMENT ACTIVITY

	Placement Office Activity--Estimated Percentage to:		Estimated Co. Recruiting on Campus	Estimated Average Salary Offers
	Counseling	Placement		
Univ. of Mass. at Amherst[1]	30	70	85	$19,000
Univ. of Mass., Boston	60	40	45	$17,000
Univ. of Lowell	50	50	250	$17,800
S.E. Mass. Univ.	70	30	24	$16,000
Average				$17,450
Nationally per College Placement Council:				
Accounting				$19,464
Business				$18,084
Marketing				$17,616

[1] School of Management placement only

TABLE III

UNIVERSITIES
ENROLLMENT DATA

	% of Univ. SCH	% Change, 1978-79 to 1984-85	% Change Projected to 1987-88	1984-85 Enrollment	Projected Enrollment 1987-88
Univ. of Mass. at Amherst	7.0	- 2	0	2,000	2,000
Univ. of Mass., Boston	10.5	+119	+11%	1,487	1,650
Univ. of Lowell	15.9	+ 35	-10%	1,857	1,660
S.E. Mass. Univ.	14.3	+ 10	+23%	1,132	1,391
Averages	11.9	+ 42	+ 6	1,619	1,675
Total Enrollments				6,476	6,701[a]

[a]Projected percent increase for total enrollment is 3.5%.

TABLE IV

UNIVERSITIES
MEASURES OF ADEQUACY OF NUMBER OF FACULTY
AND NUMBER OF APPROPRIATE DOCTORATES

	Student/ Faculty Ratio	Adequacy of Total Faculty			Adequacy of Number of Appropriate Doctorates			% of FTE Fac. with Doctorates
		Minimum FTE Fac.[1]	Actual FTE Fac.	% Actual of Min.	Minimum[2]	Actual	% Actual of Min.	
Univ. of Mass. at Amherst	20/1	62.9	79.3	126	34.7	61.8	177	78
Univ. of Mass., Boston	13/1	34.5	68.0	197	16.4	34.0	207	50
Univ. of Lowell	19/1	53.5	62.0	116	26.1	35.8	137	58
S.E. Mass. Univ.	27	34.4	29.8	86	16.3	5.0	31	13
Totals		185.3	247.2		93.5	136.6		
Averages for 4 Univ.	19/1	46.3	61.2	131	23.4	34.1	146	49
AACSB maximum for accreditation	25/1							
Very good accredited schools	19/1			135				80
9 Florida univ.	20.1			128			171	69

[1] Minimum for AACSB accreditation

[2] The minimum is calculated as 50 percent of the minimum FTE faculty for the undergraduate program plus 75 percent of the minimum FTE faculty for the graduate program.

TABLE V

UNIVERSITIES
MEASURES OF QUALITY OF FACULTY AND SCHOLARLY
PRODUCTIVITY OTHER THAN TEACHING (5 YEAR RECORD)

	UMA	UMB	UL	SMU	Averages--8 Fla. Universities; Two Years Only
Articles in refereed journals					
Number of faculty publishing	48	21	25	3	
Percent of total faculty	61	29	40	8	
Number of articles	274	63	68	7	48
Articles per FTE faculty	3.50	.92	1.09	.23	.66
Average per year per FTE faculty	.70	.18	.30	.05	.33
Books published					
Number of faculty publishing	20	3		2	13
Number of books	34	5		2	
Books per FTE faculty	.42	.07		.07	.20
Papers presented nationally					
Number of faculty	40	21	8	2	
Percent of total faculty	50	31	13	5	
Number of presentations	190	67	12	2	47
Papers per FTE faculty per year	.58	.20	.04	.07	.24
Papers presented regionally					
Number of faculty	27	16	16	1	
Percent of total faculty	34	24	26	3	
Number of presentations	66	37	26	5	31
Papers per FTE faculty per year	.17	.11	.08	.03	.16

NOTE: When using the Florida university data, it must be kept in mind that it is for two years only and that for Massachusetts universities it is based on five years.

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF FUNDING PROVIDED BUSINESS PROGRAMS BY UNIVERSITIES

	UMA	UMB	UL	SMU
College budget as a:				
Percent of University SCH	7.0	10.5	15.9	14.3
Percent of total instructional budget[1]	5.2	9.0	10.7	7.9
Percent that budget percent is of SCH percent[2]	74.0	86.0	67.0	55.0
Percent of administrative budget	5.1	15.7	12.6	2.2
Percent of instructional staff budget	5.1	7.7	10.9	7.8
Percent of secretarial/ clerical budget	4.4	12.0	7.6	3.2
Percent of supplies and materials budget	2.2[3]	7.7	5.7	6.4
Percent of travel budget	14.0	15.6	23.5	10.4
Percent of graduate assistant budget	8.6	3.7	7.2	0

[1]Average for 9 Florida universities was 13.6 percent.

[2]Average for 9 Florida universities was 76 percent.

[3]May not be comparable. Included library and publications budget.

TABLE VII

BUDGET RELATIONSHIPS
AND FUNDING FOR UNIVERSITIES
PROVIDED BY STATE APPROPRIATION

	UMA	UMB	UL	SMU	Avg. for Mass. Univs.	Avg. for 9 Fla. Univs.
University instructional budget (000)	$ 69,057	$ 22,048	$ 17,829	$ 9,802		
Business program budget (000)	$ 3,587	$ 2,733	$ 1,911	$ 770		
Dollars per FTE faculty	$ 45,269	$ 40,192	$ 30,827	$25,839	$34,151	$44,440
Dollars per FTE student	$ 2,166	$ 2,883	$ 1,447	$ 940	$ 1,859	$ 2,180
Business program support budget	$ 80,000	$ 48,845	$ 43,340	$ 6,400		
Dollars per FTE faculty	$ 1,005	$ 718	$ 699	$ 215	$ 648	$ 6,053
Dollars per FTE student	$ 290	$ 52	$ 33	$ 8	$ 96	$ 295
Support personnel						
Number of FTE sec./cler.	17	13	5	3		
FTE faculty per FTE sec./cler.	4.6	5.2	12	9.6		
Secretarial/clerical budget	$228,986	$183,600	$ 66,000	$15,750		
Secretarial/clerical dollars per FTE fac.	$ 2,889	$ 2,700	$ 1,065	$ 415	$ 1,767	$ 2,899
Travel budget	$ 35,000	$ 9,845	$ 4,300	$ 1,100		
Dollars per FTE faculty	$ 441	$ 145	$ 69	$ 29		

TABLE VIII

SALARY DATA BY RANK
UNIVERSITIES PLUS AACSB

Rank	UMA	UMB	UL	SMU	AACSB Public[1] Accred. Schools	AACSB Public[1] Non-Accred. Schools
Professor	(26)	(4)	(13)	(9)	(3341)	(906)
High	$50,576	$44,051	$46,361	$34,816	$60,000	$60,000
Mean	$40,493	$40,724	$40,944	$30,369	$40,200	$34,800
Low	$30,064	$37,397	$35,761	$25,733	$25,000	$25,000
Associate	(24)	(9)	(17)	(5)	(2768)	(1229)
High	$41,063	$38,000	$38,209	$27,000	$50,000	$50,000
Mean	$33,068	$31,173	$33,761	$24,465	$32,700	$29,400
Low	$29,090	$24,343	$29,454	$20,817	$20,000	$20,000
Assistant	(14)	(23)	(15)	(11)	(2998)	(1435)
High	$38,000	$36,502	$27,899	$25,000	$45,000	$45,000
Mean	$28,785	$30,049	$25,236	$23,127	$28.700	$24,800
Low	$20,000	$23,595	$23,850	$19,019	$20,000	$20,000
Instr./Lecturer	(4)	(11)	(6)	(2)	(1101)	(660)
High	$30,000	$33,000	$30,094	$24,000	$30,000	$30,000
Mean	$22,855	$29,500	$29,389	$21,000	$20,500	$19,500
Low	$15,000	$26,000	$23,320	$18,000	$15,000	$15,000
Hires of New Doctorates					(242)	(53)
High					$44,000	$37,000
Mean					$29,900	$27,400
Low					$25,000	$25,000

[1] Source: AACSB Salary Survey

TABLE IX

UNIVERSITIES
AVERAGE CLASS SIZES
SPRING 1984

	Average Class Size
University of Massachusetts at Amherst	36
University of Massachusetts, Boston	24
University of Lowell	39
Southeastern Massachusetts University	26
Average	31
Average for 9 Florida universities	
Lower level classes	57
Upper level classes	41

SECTION V

EMPLOYMENT PROSPECTUS

EMPLOYMENT PROSPECTUS

According to recently released statistics of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), business and management degrees accounted for almost one fourth of all bachelor's and master's degrees awarded in the United States. In Massachusetts in '83-'84 only 16.4% of the degrees awarded at these levels were in business and management. An additional 5.2% of the degrees awarded were associate degrees in business and management. Massachusetts, therefore, is producing fewer business graduates than the national average and, in addition, since many of these graduates receive their degrees from institutions which attract a large population of out of state students who leave the state upon graduation, it would appear that Massachusetts colleges and universities modest projections of increased enrollments are reasonable.

Furthermore, since 44% of all students and approximately 50% of all undergraduates are enrolled in public sector colleges and universities, and since these are the graduates more likely to remain and work in Massachusetts, the number and quality of our business graduates need to be of particular concern.

Because of the large number and diverse types of companies which hire business graduates for a myriad of positions, it is difficult to assess demand in as precise a manner as was possible in

1. AACSB Newsline
   Volume I6, No.1
   Oct. 1985, P.5

engineering and nursing. Companies differ also in size, maturity, geographic location and philosophical orientation, all of which affects the type and number of business graduates they hire. Furthermore, fewer national studies have been carried out in this occupational field to use as models and with which to compare results. A detailed manpower study would be difficult, costly and perhaps not very useful except to indicate that demand exists. Therefore, a decision was made to conduct a sample survey of Massachusetts companies - large and small - from different geographical areas. The sample is neither exhaustive nor totally representative but it does permit us to draw some conclusions about the perception of the quality of our public sector business programs and it points to areas which need strengthening within the curricula. A list of the companies surveyed and a list of the questions asked of them are included.

Employers were contacted to ascertain those characteristics most important in hiring Business graduates. Sixteen businesses were surveyed to determine specific characteristics sought in hiring entry level and other graduates from business programs. Although differences in hiring practices were noted between large and small companies, certain common themes emerged. Communication, presentation, and interpersonal skills were considered extremely important and often were the deciding factors in hiring one individual over another with the same qualifications on paper. Work experience obtained either through internship programs or actual jobs was

highly desirable. These emphases echo the advice given to our colleges and universities by our evaluators. They stressed the need to include within the curriculum courses and/or experiences which develop these skills.

Larger companies selectively recruited for new hires and tended to lean more heavily on the reputation of schools. Most of these positions appeared to be closed to graduates of state colleges and universities with the exception of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Larger companies tended to have management training programs which were highly competitive and selective. In metropolitan Boston, larger companies have a sizeable pool from which to select new hires. The best students get the select jobs. Companies will hire from the rest of the available pool , if graduates are willing to accept jobs which do not fully utilize their levels of preparation. In both Boston and Springfield, for example, both four year and two year graduates are competing for certain types of jobs.

Another area where considerable improvement is needed is in placement activities. Much more needs to be done in locating job opportunities for graduates and in training graduates in interviewing techniques. Almost every company indicated that if two applicants appeared similar on paper, the decision to hire would be based upon interviews. These findings strongly support the recommendation of the team.

Increased contact with the business community would be desirable. For example, one company Personnel Director indicated that she had never met the Placement Officer at a nearby public college and therefore, did not send notices of vacancies or new job opportunities to that college. She suggested that placement officers be more aggressive. Another company officer recommended a clearing house through which resumes of graduates of state colleges and universities could be funneled to firms seeking new graduates. This might serve as a means of penetrating the selective hiring processes utilized by many companies.

In the main, only graduates from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst are competitive with graduates from selected independent colleges for entrance into Executive Management training programs and for other management level positions in large companies. This results mostly from the recruiting practices and the emphasis placed by these companies upon the reputation of the college. Graduates from the other university and state college campuses tend to be hired by regional employers which are smaller in size and less in need of high level management people. This fact is reflected in the average salary levels for new entrants. It was substantially higher for the University of Massachusetts at Amherst graduates than for the other state college and university graduates.

When hiring graduates at the advanced level, 13 of the 16 companies surveyed preferred those with an M.B.A. or a "mixed" degree (an undergraduate degree in business and a specialized M.S., not M.A., in computer science, accounting or other such field.)

This sample survey points clearly to those areas in which state colleges and universities, with the exception of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, need to focus more attention in order to improve the opportunities available to their graduates. Increasing emphasis on communication and presentation skills throughout the curriculum, developing internship opportunities for students and assisting students with interviewing skills and with placement are three areas that command immediate attention and should enhance students salability in the job market.

Armetrage International
Barbara Watts
Personnel Director

Boston Bank of Commerce
Ronald Homer
President

Boston Edison
Marnie Walsh
Training and Development Administrator

Colonial Management Associates
Lucinda Hines
Personnel Director

Deloitte, Lloyd Haskins and Sells
John Veryzen
Personnel Recruiter

Harvard University
Rod McDougall
Treasurer

Houghton Mifflin Company
Valerie Fay
Personnel Manager

Howbridge House
Tom F. Casey
Director of Personnel

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Professor Frank S. Jones
Former Business School Graduate Dean

Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company
Shirley Carpenter
Director of Personnel

Massachusetts Rating Service
Jan Fair
Personnel Administrator

Monarch Life and Monarch Capital
James Twaddle
Vice President of Personnel

Nashoba Community Hospital
Alan Wolff
Vice President

Norton Company
Samuel Davenport
Manager of Staffing and
Personnel Administration

Shawmut Bank
Linda Tufo
Director of College Relations
and Recruiting

Sunder Associates
Jane LeFavor
Consultant

Wang Laboratories
James McAvoy
Director of Personnel

SURVEY QUESTIONS

1. What characteristics and skills do you look for in entry level hires?

2. How are entry level salaries determined?

3. When hiring at the advanced degree level, do you prefer MBA or M.S. in Management graduates?

4. If two individuals appear very similar on paper what criteria would be used to select one of the two?

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF AACSB ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

A SUMMARY OF MINIMUM STANDARDS
FOR AACSB ACCREDITATION

The AACSB Accreditation Council Policies, Procedures and Standards, 1984-85, deserve more attention than this summary provides. Copies may be obtained from the AACSB, 605 Old Ballas Road, Suite 220, St. Louis, Missouri 63141; (314) 872-8481. Given below is a skeleton of the standards:

1. Accreditation Philosophy and Preconditions

   1.1 If an institution offers bachelor's and master's level programs, both must be accreditable.

   1.2 Business programs offered by faculty of divisions other than the business division must be under the jurisdiction of the business program faculty or that faculty must have participating control.

   1.3 The business program must be constituted as a degree recommending school or college reporting to the central administration.

   1.4 The institution must be accredited by an institutional accrediting body recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.

   1.5 The administrative head of the business unit must have jurisdiction or participating control over all business administration programs and business administration faculty.

2. Objectives

   The business unit shall clearly state its objectives and they shall be consistent with the overall high quality embodied in the standards.

3. Admission of Students

   3.1 Undergraduate level

      3.11 ". . . Admission and retention standards (for undergraduates) should compare favorably to those of the university or college as a whole."

3.12 Transfer credits

". . . the degree-granting institution will use validation procedures each time a student takes a course at the lower division level which the degree-granting institution offers at the upper division level and which is to be accepted for upper division credit in business administration or economics."

3.2 Masters level

3.21 "At the master's level, schools (will) limit their admission to holders of a baccalaureate degree from institutions accredited by a COPA recognized institutional accrediting agency."

3.211 . . .at least 2 of the following categories shall be employed in the admissions process:

(1) Testing using the GMAT or other relevant testing device

(2) Grade point average prior to master's admission

(3) Experience in appropriate employment

3.212 . . ."at least 80% shall have met the school's stated criteria. In determining this 80% students identified under the title of provisional, conditional, unclassified-probationary, non-degree, etc., shall be included."

3.213 "When the combination used is the GMAT-total score and the overall or upper division GPA. . .candidates. . . (admissible. . .shall have). . . a total of at least 950 points based on the formula: 200 times the overall GPA plus the GMAT total score; or at least 1000 points

on the formula: 200 times the upper division GPA plus the GMAT total score. . ."

4. Personnel

4.1 "The faculty as a whole shall be of sufficient number and shall demonstrate the capabilities, experience, professional involvement, instructional performance, scholarly productivity and service essential for overall high quality."

4.2 "The school shall have plans and policies that encourage and provide a framework for continuing professional development and increasing productivity of its faculty."

4.3 "The FTE faculty shall be not less than the sum of the following: for the undergraduate program, one FTE per 400 SCH taught per term; for the graduate program, one FTE per 300 SCH taught per term."

4.4 "The number of FTE faculty holding. . .the appropriate doctoral degree shall be not less than the sum of 50% of the minimum of faculty required at the undergraduate level (see 4.3 above) excluding principles of accounting courses taught by those who have both the master's degree and an appropriate professional certification, and of 75% of the minimum faculty required at the graduate level (see 4.3 above).

4.5 Those faculty possessing the J.D. degree who teach business law or legal environment subjects (shall be considered to have an appropriate doctorate).

4.6 "The number of full-time faculty shall be at least 75% of the FTE faculty required (see 4.3 above).

4.7 "The number and qualifications of faculty and their distribution among day and evening course offerings and locations shall be such that each group of students has reasonable and comparable opportunity to study with doctoral, full-time and other qualified faculty in each subject field."

4.8 "Members of the faculty should not teach courses in excess of 12 credit hours per week, have preparations in more than 3 different courses per week, nor teach in more than 2 fields. Assignment of responsibilities for graduate instruction, research direction, and thesis supervision or other major responsibilities should result in downward adjustment of the teaching load" (including teaching at all institutions in which the faculty member teaches).

4.9 ". . .the faculty shall have a staff of support and service personnel commensurate with the stated objectives of the school."

5. Curriculum

5.1 "An undergraduate school of business should concentrate its professional courses in the last two years of a four-year program and should offer only a limited amount of work below the junior year."

"Examples of courses which might be offered at the lower division level are: principles of accounting, principles of economics, business law, statistics, and introduction to business. Examples of courses which should be offered only at the upper division level are: principles of finance, principles of management and principles of marketing."

5.2 ". . .40% to 60% of the course work in the baccalaureate program shall be devoted to studies in business administration and economics. . . .40% to 60%--shall be devoted to studies other than business administration and economics.

". . .Credit for remedial courses of subcollegiate level shall not (be counted)."

5.3 ". . .programs shall include. . .the equivalent of at least one year of work comprising the following areas:

(a) a background of the concepts, processes and institutions in the production and marketing of goods and/or services and the financing of the. . .enterprise. . . .

(b) . . .the economics and legal environment. . .along with ethical considerations and social and political influences. . . .

(c) . . .the concepts and applications of accounting, of quantitative methods, and management information systems including computer applications.

(d) "a study of organization theory, behavior, and interpersonal communications.

(e) a study of administrative processes under conditions of uncertainty, including integrating analysis and policy determination at the overall management level."

5.4 "Master's degree programs. . .must require students to have completed, either at the undergraduate or graduate level, the equivalent of the common body of knowledge (see 5.3 above). . . ."

5.5 ". . .the MBA degree. . .shall be broad in nature and aimed at general competence in overall management. Breadth means that. . .

at least 15 semester credit hours. . .in addition to that in the common body of knowledge outside the field of specialization."

5.6 . . .the MBA will require for (90%) of the students a minimum of 2 semesters of academic work in addition to the common body of knowledge and the baccalaureate degree in classes reserved exclusively for graduate students.

6. Library and computer resources, facilities and services

6.1 ". . .sufficient (literature and reference materials) to meet the objectives of the business unit. . . ."

6.2 "Computer hardware, software and support resources. . .shall be of sufficient capacity and accessibility to support. . .objectives. . . ."

7. Financial resources, facilities and equipment

7.1 "The budget shall be sufficient. . . ."

7.2 "The physical facilities. . .shall be suitable. . . ."

8. Educational innovation and technology

8.1 "Innovation. . .is encouraged. . . ."

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges AUG 8 1986